DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 329 303 JC 910 121

TITLE	Summative Review of the Associate in Arts Degree Program in Florida Community Colleges. Volume I: The Text. Volume II: The Appendix.
INSTITUTION	Florida State Board of Community Colleges, Tallahassee.
PUB DATE	Feb 91
NOTE	303p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Statistical Data (110)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC13 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Articulation (Education); *Associate Degrees; College Faculty; College Outcomes Assessment; College Transfer Students; *Community Colleges; *Curriculum Evaluation; Educational Facilities; *Educational Finance; Enrollment Trends; Intercollegiate Cooperation; *Program Evaluation; Standardized Tests; State Surveys; *Student Characteristics; Teaching Methods; Two Year Colleges; Universities
IDENTIFIERS	*Florida

ABSTRACT

In the Florida Community College System (FCCS) the Associate in Arts (A.A.) program provides students with a two-year transfer degree. In an effort to determine the need for state initiatives, policy changes, and funding priorities, a program review was conducted which examined a series of 19 issues regarding student characteristics, student performance and outcomes, enrollment trends, curriculum and instruction, testing and services, faculty development and employment criteria, and learning resources. The review process involved the use of surveys sent to all colleges in the system, data gathered from hearings involving over 120 faculty and administrators, and an analysis of existing data. Volume I of this two-volume review examines the study purpose, process, findings, and recommendations, while volume II consists of a series of appendixes. Study highlights include the following: (1) of students who completed the degree, approximately two-thirds transfered to a four-year institution; (2) despite charges to the contrary, the A.A. courses did not appear to engage in grade inflation as compared to four-year institutions; (3) enrollment in A.A. programs was increasing more consistently than enrollment in vocational programs; (4) the system for identifying remedial students was found to be flawed and in need of restructuring; (5) 14.57% of the full-time equivalent enrollees in 1989-90 were not state-funded; and (6) a need for additional funding to improve instruction in the skills required to successfully complete the College-Level Academic Skills Test was identified. Appendixes include the test instrument and tabulated responses, selected cost analysis data, lists of hearing attendees, and lists of recommendations. (JMC)

ED329303

FLORIDA STATE BOARD OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Summative Review

of the

Associate in Arts Degree Program

in

Florida Community Colleges

JC 910121
(2 of 2)

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F. W. Atherton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Program Review Report

Volume I - The Text

Volume I I - The Appendix

February 1991

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PREFACE

Each Florida community college provides a program of instruction consisting of courses offered to freshmen and sophomores in baccalaureate programs. Upon satisfactory completion of a planned program, the associate in arts degree is awarded. The associate in arts degree is the basic degree in community colleges for student transfer to upper division (junior/senior) programs in the state universities.

The review of the associate in arts degree programs in Florida community colleges is a multi-level process involving community college personnel, university personnel, students, consultants, Department of Education personnel, accrediting bodies, public school personnel, and the community. One review strategy is reviews of individual discipline groupings. Another review strategy is the review of the degree program as a whole. The latter is the nature of the review reported herein, therefore the use of the word, summative.

Appreciation is expressed to the many people who participated in this review. Special appreciation is expressed to the members of the Advisory Committee, to the people who completed the questionnaire, and to the people who attended and participated in the regional hearings.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME I. THE TEXT

PREFACE iii

TABLE OF CONTENTS v

LIST OF TABLES ix

INTRODUCTION 1

PURPOSE 3

PROCESS 7

- Advisory Committee 7
- Literature Review 8
- Management Information System Data 10
- Issues Determination 10
- Questionnaire 10
- Hearings 11

FINDINGS 13

- Student Characteristics 13
- Upper Division Student Performance 17
- Community College/University Faculty Interaction 26
- Student Outcomes 32
  - Grades 32
  - Graduation 36
  - Transfer Rate 44
  - Nontransfer Uses of the Degree 48

College-Level Academic Skills Test 49
Program Effectiveness Measures 59
Enrollment Trends 60
Curriculum and Instruction 70
College Preparatory Instruction 70
General Education 82
International Education 88
Instructional Methods 90
Class Size 92
Faculty 96
Full-Time/Part-Time Faculty 96
Employment Criteria 103
Faculty Development 105
Learning Resources 111
Advisement 117
Equipment 122
Costs 122
Equal Access 131
SUMMARY 135

VOLUME II. THE APPENDIX

APPENDIX 141
1. Associate in Arts Degree Program Review Task Force 141
2. Advisory Committee for the Summative Review of the Associate in Arts Degree Program 143

3. Questionnaire, Summative Review of the Associate in Arts Degree Program 145

4. Responses to the Questionnaire, Summative Review of the Associate in Arts Degree Program 155

5. Key to Symbols on Level I Program Review Data Displays 183

6. Results of Articulation Meetings, Level II A. A. Program Review 185

7. Needs Recommended for Consideration, Level II A. A. Program Review Articulation Meetings 191

8. A. A. Degree Graduates in SUS Upper Division by Ethnic Group and Gender . . . 197

9. A. A. Degree Program Innovations 203

10. Supplemental Appropriations for Libraries 205

11. Selected Cost Analysis Data 207

12. Attendance at Hearings 243

13. List of Recommendations 247

LIST OF TABLES

VOLUME I. THE TEXT

Table Page

1. A. A. Degree Program Enrollment by Gender, 1988-89 14

2. A. A. Degree Program Enrollment by Ethnic Group, 1988-89 15

3. Student Performance in SUS Upper Division 19

4. Student Headcount in SUS Upper Division, Fall, 1989 21

5. Level II Articulation Meetings by Discipline Grouping, A. A. Program Review 28

6. Level II Articulation Meetings by University, A. A. Program Review 30

7. Grade Frequency and Distribution 34

8. Graduates and Graduation Indexes by Ethnic Group and Gender, A. A. Degree Program . . . 39

9. Number and Percentage of Graduates by Ethnic Group, A. A. Degree Program 41

10. A. A. Degree Graduates in SUS Upper Division by Ethnic Group and Gender 47

11. CLAST Skills Areas 50

12. CLAST Pass Rates, First-Time Examinees with 60 or More Credits 51

13. CLAST Mean Scores, First-Time Examinees . . . 53

14. CLAST Cumulative Pass Rates, March 1988 Cohort Through Six Administrations, Community College and University 54

Table Page

15. CLAST Mean Scores and Pass Rates, Black and Hispanic First-Time Examinees 56

16. Full-Time Equivalent Student Enrollment, Trends 61

17. Program Enrollment, Trends 63

18. Enrollment Proportions of Selected Categories, Trends 65

19. Program Enrollment by Ethnic Group, Number and Percentage, Trends 68

20. Selected Ethnic Group Representation Comparisons, H. S. Graduates/Degree and Certificate Enrollment 70

21. College Preparatory Testing Results 72

22. Range of General Education Credits Required in Community College A. A. Degree Programs 83

23. Range of Courses Offered to Meet General Education Requirements in Community Colleges 86

24. Enrollment in A. A. Degree Program Courses Overseas 90

25. Average Class Sizes in Advanced and Professional Courses, 1987-88 94

26. Number of Teaching Faculty, Part-Time/Full-Time, State Community College System 98

27. Percentages of Sections, Students, Credits Taught by Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty, Advanced and Professional Courses, 1987-88 100

28. Library Services Available 113

29. Supplemental Appropriations for Library Print and Nonprint Materials, 1984-91 . . . 115

30. Learning Resources, Direct Costs, 1984-90 117

Table Page

31. Quality of Academic Advising in A. A. Degree Programs, Self-Ratings 119

32. Costs per FTE Student, A & P; Total Support; and Academic Support, Learning Resources, 1984-89 124

33. FTE Student Enrollment, State Funded/Actual, Advanced and Professional Courses, 1986-90 127

34. Unfunded FTE Student Enrollment, A & P, Vocational, Adult General, 1986-90 128

35. Professional Personnel Changes, Florida Community Colleges, 1978-88 131

36. Professional Personnel Changes, U. S. Colleges and Universities, 1975-85 131

VOLUME II. THE APPENDIX

37. Supplemental Appropriations for Libraries 205

To those who teach and those who learn

INTRODUCTION

The State Board of Community Colleges is required to review instructional programs every five years (Sections 240.147(5) and 240.312, Florida Statutes, and Rule 6A-10.039, FAC). The review of the associate in arts degree program includes separate reviews of each of the major discipline groupings in the program on a five-year cycle. The review reported herein was a summative review of the associate in arts degree program; that is, a review of the program as a whole.

The review process contains three phases referred to as levels. Level I is an annual production by the Division of Community Colleges of data displays of the performance of community college graduates in upper division programs in the state universities compared with the performance of native students and of other students. Level II is the review by the community colleges of selected discipline groupings suggested by the Level I data displays and other stimuli, and includes meetings between the community college discipline grouping faculty and the same discipline grouping faculty from the state universities. Level III is statewide, state-level, issue-oriented reviews by the State Board of Community Colleges, correlated with the five-year cycle reviews of the Board of Regents. The summative review of the associate in arts degree program was a Level III review incorporating Level I and Level II findings.

In Florida public, postsecondary education, the community colleges constitute the primary entry point for baccalaureate programs, and the associate in arts degree is the two-year, transfer degree. The associate in arts degree is defined by the State Board of Education in Rule 6A-14.030(1), FAC.

> (1) Associate in arts degree. Each community college shall provide programs of instruction consisting of courses offered to freshmen and sophomores in baccalaureate programs. The courses shall be classified in the Community College Management Information System as advanced and professional courses. Satisfactory completion of courses within the programs shall be recognized by the award of units of measure called college credit. Upon satisfactory completion of a planned program of sixty (60) college credits, including the demonstration of the attainment of predetermined and specified performance requirements, and subject to law and rule, the associate in arts degree shall be awarded.

The reference in the definition to performance requirements and to law and rule primarily cover the thirty-six credit minimum general education core and the 2.0 minimum grade point average in Rule 6A-10.024(3)(4), FAC, the English and mathematics course requirements in Rule 6A-10.030, FAC, and the college-level communication and mathematics curriculum and testing provisions in Rule 6A-10.0314, FAC.

PURPOSE

The primary purpose of the statewide, state-level, issue-oriented, summative review of the associate in arts degree program in the State Community College System was to determine needs for state initiatives, policy changes, and funding priorities. The objectives included analysis to learn what Level I and Level II reviews reveal, inquiry and analysis to identify conditions and trends in aspects of the program, inquiry and analysis to study nineteen issue questions listed below, and the development of recommendations addressing the findings.

Issues

1. What percent of associate in arts degree seeking students graduate? What percent of the community college prep students graduate? If not known, are there any studies to determine the number? What might be a model study design?

2. What percent of associate in arts degree graduates enter upper division programs and where?

3. What percent of associate in arts degree graduates who enter SUS upper division programs are in each discipline grouping? Determine by race and gender.

4. What is the impact of the range of general education courses? Have the outcomes of general education been specified? Are any general education studies underway?

5. What methods of instruction are used? Can curriculum and instruction innovations and models be

identified?

6. How and to what extent is international education factored into the associate in arts degree program?

7. Are there assessments of program effectiveness in addition to the CLAST and the Level I program review data displays? Should there be?

8. What findings would result from putting a sample of associate in arts degree graduates through the Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program?

9. What are the proportions of full-time and part-time faculty, by discipline and in terms of the number of course sections and the number of credit hours registered?

10. What is the average number of years of service of part-time faculty?

11. What orientation, support services, and training are provided for part-time faculty, and for full-time faculty?

12. What are the criteria for faculty selection, retention, and dismissal?

13. Are there problems keeping faculty, including department chairs, current in their disciplines and involved in teaching methods training? What is being done to keep faculty current and involved?

14. What are the student/teacher ratios in the seven disciplines in the Level III program review model and in the "Gordon rule" courses?

15. What is the range of services provided by learning resource centers? What is the trend in funding provided learning resource centers? Are the services of the centers effective? Are the services provided at off-campus sites?

16. What are enrollment trends by age, race, and gender and in comparison with associate in science degree enrollment and with postsecondary adult vocational enrollment?

17. Is academic advisement sufficient? How is it accomplished?

18. Is there an equity issue?

19. What should be done during the next few years to improve the associate in arts degree programs?

5/6

PROCESS

The process by which the summative review of the associate in arts degree program was conducted was based on the model developed with a task force of fifteen members of community college and university personnel and staff from the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission and the Divisions of Community Colleges and of Universities. The membership list is in appendix 1. The elements of the process are described below.

Advisory Committee

An advisory committee for the summative review of the associate in arts degree program was established to help with the identification and analysis of specific issues, to help with the development of a questionnaire, to help with the conduct of hearings, to help with the identification of statewide strengths and weaknesses in the program, and to help with the formulation of recommendations. The advisory committee of ten members included community college and university personnel and staff from the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission and the Division of Universities. The membership list is in appendix 2.

Literature Review

An ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges search for documents and publications dealing with general education content, structure, design, and purpose was ordered and received. Providing a bibliography of materials found through the ERIC search and other means and of materials read is not the purpose of this report. However, the extensive and complex variety of materials available that touch on all aspects of general education and the transfer associate degree is such that illustrations without judgment of quality or significance may interest some readers. Therefore, the following few illustrations are provided, and are placed here rather than in an appendix.

Belcher, Marcia J. "Fulfilling the Transfer Mission: A Follow-Up of Miami-Dade Graduates to Upper Division." Miami: Miami-Dade Community College, Research Report No. 87-25, June 1987.

"Best Colleges: Special Report." U.S. News and World Report. 10 October 1988, C28.

Cheney, Lynne V. 50 Hours: A core Curriculum for College Students. Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities, October 1989.

DeLoughry, Thomas J. "Study of Transcripts Finds Little Structure in the Liberal Arts." Chronicle of Higher Education, 18 January 1989, A1.

Eisenberg, Diane U., and James F. Gollattscheck, eds. The Future of Humanities Education at Community, Technical, and Junior Colleges. Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities, 1986.

Greenwood, Elaine A. "Proceedings of General Education Workshop of the Central Florida Consortium of Higher Education at Seminole Community College, February 3, 1989." Sanford, Seminole Community College, 1989.

Judd, R. Bruce. The Value of a Terminal Associate in Arts Degree to the Community College Graduates: Analysis of Economic Data. Paper presented as part of the Annual Meeting of the Council on Universities and Colleges, Washington, D.C., March 1989.

Lewis, Laurie L., and Elizabeth Farris. Undergraduate General Education and Humanities Requirements. Higher Education Survey Report, Survey Number 7, January 1989.

Losak, John. "What Constitutes Student Success in the Community College?" Community College Journal for Research and Planning 5 (Fall/Winter 1986).

Lukenbill, Jeffrey D. General Education in a Changing Society. Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, 1978.

Parnell, Dale, ed. Associate Degree Preferred. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1985.

Report of the Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program. 1988-1989 Summary of Findings: Annual Report. Tallahassee: Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program, May 1989.

Report of the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission. An Assessment of the General Education Curriculum in State Universities and Community Colleges. Tallahassee: Department of Education, 1989.

Report of the Task Force to Improve Mathematics, Science, and Computer Education. Improving Math and Science Education: A Business Agenda. Tallahassee: The Florida Chamber, 1989.

Sagan, Carl. "Why We Need to Understand Science." Parade Magazine, 10 September 1989, 6.

Urban Community Colleges Commission. Minorities in Urban Community Colleges: Tomorrow's Students Today. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1988.

Management Information System Data

Information from the various management information systems of the divisions of the Department of Education was analyzed to learn what Level I and Level II reviews reveal, to help determine conditions and trends in aspects of the associate in arts degree program, and to help the study of the nineteen issue questions listed in the chapter on purpose.

Issues Determination

The advisory committee met and produced an initial draft of a list of issue questions. The advisory committee then refined the initial draft by mail. The issue questions were deliberated at a meeting of the community college Council on Instructional Affairs. Changes proposed by the Council were incorporated to produce the nineteen issue questions listed in the chapter on purpose.

Questionnaire

The advisory committee was mailed a draft of a questionnaire developed around the issue questions listed in the chapter on purpose. The committee met and the draft questionnaire items were revised, reworded, reformated, deleted, and supplemented. The changes were incorporated and a second draft was mailed to the advisory committee. The second draft was deliberated at a meeting of community college reports coordinators and amended accordingly to produce the questionnaire used in the summative review of the associate in arts degree program. The questionnaire is in appendix 3.

All of the community colleges filled out and returned the questionnaire. The reponses were compiled into a report that presented individual responses in random or aggregate fashion. The report is in appendix 4.

Hearings

Five hearings were held to obtain interaction with and among faculty and administrators associated with the associate in arts degree program. The hearings dealt with the issues affecting the associate in arts degree program and the findings from the questionnaire. State University System vice presidents for academic affairs and public school superintendents were invited to attend or send representatives.

The hearings were held at Gulf Coast Community College, Lake City Community College, Manatee Community College, Broward Community College, and Valencia Community College. The hearings were attended by 120 community college faculty and administrators, ten university personnel, and three public school system personnel. Represented were twenty-five community colleges, six state universities, one out-of-state university, and three public school systems.

FINDINGS

This chapter presents the findings and recommendations from the summative review of the associate in arts degree program in the State Community College System. The organization of the chapter follows the review elements in the model for the review developed with a task force of fifteen members of community college and university personnel and staff from the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission and the Divisions of Community Colleges and of Universities.

Student Characteristics

For readers to understand and to use intelligently the findings herein, they must know and understand the nature of community colleges and of community college students. While that necessity may be viewed as self-evident, consistent adherence is questioned. Perhaps because most of the community colleges are less than thirty years old, decision makers do not tend automatically to distinguish between the characteristics of community college students and of residential, four-year college students. Their own experiences tend to be closer to those of the latter.

A tendency may be to think of college freshmen and sophomores as eighteen and nineteen years old. In Florida community colleges, the 1987-88 average age of the associate in arts degree students ranged from twenty-two at three community colleges to thirty-two at one community college. Twenty-five was the mode (seven community colleges). The second most frequent average age was twenty-seven (five community colleges). See appendix 4, item 22. The fall, 1988 average age of the associate in arts degree students was twenty-four. Associate in arts degree students in the community colleges tend to be adults who have been out of high school for at least several years, meaning that they have been wage earners and may have established homes and families.

Women have outnumbered men in associate in arts degree program enrollment for years. Table 1 shows that 56 percent of the 1988-89 associate in arts degree students were women.

TABLE 1

A.A. Degree Program Enrollment
By Gender
1988-89

Male	77,449	44%
Female	98,102	56%
Total	175,551	100%

Ethnic groupings other than white account for only small percentages of associate in arts degree program enrollment. See table 2. That is true at individual community colleges as well as systemwide, except at Miami-Dade Community College where Hispanics constituted 53.6 percent of the enrollment and at North Florida Junior College where blacks constituted 19.1 percent of the enrollment in 1988-89.

TABLE 2

A.A. Degree Program Enrollment
By Ethnic Group
1988-89

Alien	2,984	1.70%
Asian	3,156	1.80%
Indian	652	.37%
Black	14,371	8.18%
Hispanic	16,671	9.50%
White	137,717	78.45%
Total	175,551	100.00%

Part-time students far outnumber full-time students. Of the students enrolled in college credit courses the fall term of 1988, 66 percent were part-time and 34 percent were full-time. This means that two out of every three students view college as a minor part of their lives that competes with other responsibilities such as families and jobs.

The community colleges have open admissions policies requiring only high school or equivalent diplomas. Many of the students did not follow a college preparatory curriculum in high school. Also, the longer the wait after high school graduation, the more may be forgotten.

Degree-seeking, first-time-in-college students in the State Community College System are tested to determine whether they need remediation in reading, writing, and mathematics before attempting college credit courses. Approximately 25 percent of the students fail to achieve a minimum score standard in reading and writing and approximately 50 percent fail to achieve a minimum score standard in mathematics.

A significant percentage of associate in arts degree students do not approach the degree as a transfer degree. They use the degree for other purposes than to transfer into upper divisions of baccaluareate programs. Dr. R. Bruce Judd found in his dissertation study at the University of Florida of the value of the associate in arts degree as a terminal degree that 30 to 40 percent of associate in arts degree graduates do not transfer. The Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP) found that 63 percent of the 1988-89 associate in arts degree graduates transferred into the State University System. The questionnaire results in appendix 4, item 2 are fairly consistent with these findings.

Associate in arts degree students in the State Community College System are commuting students rather than dormitory residents. After classes, students return to their lives away from the colleges, which means they do not experience the interplay and support of campus life.

Other characteristics of community college associate in arts degree students include part-time and even full-time work. It is unusual for them to not have at least part-time jobs. It is quite usual for them to change program objectives, whether to a different planned upper division major, or to a different degree, or to a nondegree-seeking status. It is quite usual for them to interrupt their progress by not enrolling one or even more semesters, and then to resume.

In summary, the "typical" community college student in the associate in arts degree program is twenty-five years old, female, white, part-time, employed, living off campus, probably in need of remediation, likely to change instructional program objectives, and likely to interrupt consecutive enrollment.

Upper Division Student Performance

Since the associate in arts degree is the basic degree in community colleges for student transfer to upper division (junior/senior) programs in the state universities, the model for the program review logically included a study of how community college associate in arts degree graduates have performed upon transfer to state university upper division programs. As explained in the introductory chapter, Level I of the review process is the annual production of data displays of such performance. The information for the displays is obtained from records of the Division of Universities.

The reader must recognize that the grade point average information on the Level I program review data displays is based only on grades earned at the university. Grades earned by community college associate in arts degree graduates at their community colleges are not included in the university calculation of grade point averages although the lower division grades of the native university students are included in the calculation. This disparity is addressed again during the grade point average discussion later in this section.

A four-year summary of Level I data displays is in table 3. The table compares the State University System upper division performance of community college associate in arts degree graduates with the performance of other transfer students, except Florida community college associate in science degree graduates, and with the performance of native students. The points of comparison are:

TABLE 3

Student Performance in SUS Upper Division

	1988-89	1987-88	1986-87	1985-86
Headcount:				
SCCS AA Grads	31,167 34.99%	29,769 34.29%	39,741 40.22%	30,603 38.41%
SUS Natives	23,818 26.74%	21,632 24.91%	27,652 28.00%	16,387 20.57%
Others	34,095 38.27%	35,421 40.80%	31,384 31.78%	32,683 41.02%
Mean Cum GPA:				
SCCS AA Grads	2.72	2.70	2.7	2.7
SUS Natives	2.80	2.79	2.8	2.7
Others	2.77	2.75	2.8	2.7
3.0 & Above GPA:				
SCCS AA Grads	36.1%	35.3%	35.1%	37.5%
SUS Natives	37.4%	36.8%	37.4%	35.2%
Others	39.9%	38.5%	40.3% *	38.7%
Below 2.0 GPA:				
SCCS AA Grads	10.7% x	11.7% x	11.2% x	11.4% x
SUS Natives	2.1% *	1.9% *	1.9% *	3.1% *
Others	8.2%	8.9%	8.2%	5.5% *
Suspended:				
SCCS AA Grads	3.0%	3.4%	2.8%	2.8%
SUS Natives	.8%	1.0%	.9%	1.2%
Others	2.6%	2.8%	2.3%	1.5%
Graduated:				
SCCS AA Grads	20.3% x	20.2% x	15.1% x	14.5% x
SUS Natives	25.6% *	24.3%	18.8%	21.7% *
Others	22.6%	21.4%	15.7%	17.9%
Avg SSH Per Term:				
SCCS AA Grads	8.9	8.7	8.6	9.2
SUS Natives	10.8	10.6	10.4	11.1
Others	8.8	8.5	8.6	10.8
Avg Tot SSH To Degree:				
SCCS AA Grads	138.1	137.7	137.8	127.0
SUS Natives	133.4	134.0	134.3	119.3
Others	140.0	139.9	141.0	121.7

GPAs are based only on grades received at the university.
A key in appendix 5 defines the x and * indicators.

1. Unduplicated count of students classified by the universities as upper division.
2. Mean grade point average of students based on courses taken at the university.
3. Percentage of students with grade point averages of 3.0 or above.
4. Percentage of students with grade point averages below 2.0.
5. Percentage of students suspended for academic reasons by the university as of the close of the last term in the report period.
6. Percentage of students who graduated during the report period.
7. Average number of credits earned by the students per term during the report period.
8. Average number of total credits earned toward the degree by students who graduated during the report period.

The upper division student count in table 3 is a count of the students for whom records were sufficiently complete to be used in the Level I data display calculations. To determine whether the headcount percentages in table 3 would change when all upper division students were counted, percentages were obtained from the Division of Universities for the fall, 1989 enrollment. See table 4.

The student count distributions in tables 3 and 4 are similar. Community college associate in arts degree graduates comprise about one-third of the university upper division enrollment. In some upper division programs, they comprise more than half of the

TABLE 4

Student Headcount
In SUS Upper Division
Fall, 1989

SUS AA Graduates		32.20%
SUS Natives		25.63%
Other CC Transfers	12.38%	
Non CC Transfers	29.79%	
		42.17%
		100.00%

enrollment. It is useful to note that when community college transfers without the associate in arts degree are included, nearly half the university upper division enrollment is from the community colleges. There quite obviously is very strong reason for the universities to be as interested in good articulation between the community colleges and the universities as are the community colleges.

The mean cumulative grade point averages in table 3 include lower division grades for the native students but do not include lower division grades for community college associate in arts degree graduates. This places the community college associate in arts degree graduates at a comparison disadvantage, because they do not have the "cushion" of sixty plus credits averaging 2.0 or above that the native students have. Still, the 1988-89 mean for community college associate in arts degree graduates is within .08 of the mean for native students. In addition to overall minimum grade point averages, the Level I data displays show the averages for each upper division discipline grouping. Only in science, particularly life science, are there consistent differences of any magnitude. The mean cumulative grade point averages for native students in life science in 1988-89, 1987-88, 1986-87, and 1985-86 were about .30 higher than for community college associate in arts degree graduates. A Level III program review of science has been conducted, in which these differences were addressed.

Table 3 shows little difference among the comparison groups in the percentages with grade point averages of 3.0 or above, except between community college associate in arts degree graduates and other transfer students in 1986-87. An asterisk appears at that point in the table. The Level I data displays signal variations from predetermined parameters with an "x" or "*." The key is in appendix 5. In this instance, the parameter is a five percentage point range, but the difference is 5.2 percentage points; therefore, the signal. The parameters do not constitute quality measures. They are intended to stimulate further investigation by the community colleges.

At the other end of the grade point average scale, the performance of community college associate in arts degree graduates was not as good as that of native students. Table 3 shows there were nearly ten percentage points fewer native students with less than 2.0 grade point averages each of the four years. One parameter in this instance is that no more than 10 percent of the community college associate in arts degree graduates have less than 2.0 grade point averages, but the percentages shown are about eleven each of the four years. A second parameter in this instance is a five percentage point range, but the differences are nearly twice that each of the four years. On this point of comparison, the absence of a grade point average cushion for community college associate in arts degree graduates as explained earlier in this subsection, and the well researched phenomenon called transfer shock are readily apparent.

Consistent with the greater percentage with grade point averages below 2.0, community college associate in arts degree graduates should be expected to have higher suspension rates. Table 3 shows that is the case, but the rates are within the predetermined parameters.

One parameter for the graduation index is a minimum index of 25 percent. None of the comparison groups was within that parameter any of the four years in table 3, except the native students in 1988-89. A second parameter is a five percentage point range, which was exceeded in two of the four years.

Overall, community college associate in arts degree graduates in the State University System perform comparably with native students and other transfer students. Only in comparison with native students regarding the percentage of students with mean cumulative grade point averages below 2.0 is the difference in overall performance of sufficient magnitude to capture attention, and here the grade point average calculation disparity is a contributing factor. However, when individual discipline groupings are examined, community college associate in arts degree graduates perform less well than native students in the life sciences, mathematics, and the physical sciences. This conclusion must be considered tentative, because of the small numbers of students in the three groupings upon which to base averages, and because of the grade point average calculation disparity.

Table 3 reveals that the average course loads of all three student groups were well below a full-time load. At the rates shown for any of the four years, a community college associate in arts degree graduate would need more than six semesters to complete a minimum length upper division program and a native student would need more than five semesters. There was slightly over a one course difference in the average number of credits earned for the baccalaureate by the community college associate in arts degree graduates and the native students each of the last three years. That the community college associate in arts degree graduates earned nearly the same number of credits for the baccalaureate as the native students is a significant finding. But, the number of credits required means a full-time student would need more than five semesters to complete an average length upper division program. Factoring in average course loads, a community college associate in arts degree graduate would need nine semesters to complete an average length upper division program and a native student would need seven semesters. The idea that the baccalaureate degree is a four-year degree is erroneous, even for full-time students. Efforts have begun in the State University System to control the length of baccalaureate programs.

The predetermined parameters used for the Level I data displays were recommended by an advisory committee, which at that time had to rely on judgment without the benefit of experience under the program review system. With the production of the 1988-89 Level I data displays, the parameters have been used four years. The minimum graduation index parameter, for one, needs to be revised. It is time to evaluate the parameters.

Recommendation 1.-- Recommend the parameters used with the data on the annual Level I data displays of the associate in arts degree program review process be evaluated, and appropriate modifications accomplished for use with future data displays.

The Level I data displays are powerful instruments for evaluating the effectiveness of individual community college associate in arts degree programs. They enable the community colleges to examine whether their associate in arts degree programs do what they are designed to do as the basic degree for transfer to upper division programs in the state universities. To assure widespread use of the information, workshops, publications, and other activities could be scheduled to explain the data and their use.

Recommendation 2.-- Recommend the Division of Community Colleges devise additional strategies for distributing the associate in arts degree program review Level I data displays and for expanding their use, so that community college and university personnel more uniformly will know of them, have access to them, understand them, and use them.

Recommendation 3.-- Recommend that the community colleges, the universities, and Divisions of Community Colleges and Universities continue to study the differences in university upper division performance of community college associate in arts degree graduates, other transfer students, and native university students.

Community College/University Faculty Interaction

Since the associate in arts degree is the basic degree in community colleges for student transfer to upper division programs in the state universities, the associate in arts degree program for a given student must prepare for the upper division program that student plans to enter. To provide such instruction, community college faculty must know and understand the upper division program and its prerequisites. To assure properly prepared entering students, upper division faculty must express their entry level expectations. Direct and regular interaction between community college faculty and university upper division faculty is judged the most effective way to meet these needs and is provided for in the model for program review developed by the task force in appendix 1. The task force believed that this element of the program review process was the single, most promising feature. As explained in the introductory chapter, Level II of the review process provides for the faculty interactions, which have come to be referred to as articulation meetings.

The Level II process calls for each community college to identify individual discipline groupings for which to plan articulation meetings where the discipline faculty meet with the upper division faculty of the same discipline from the universities in which the college's graduates tend to enroll. Each college reports its planned articulation meetings to the Division of Community Colleges, and subsequently reports the articulation meetings actually conducted.

Table 5 shows the number of articulation meetings

TABLE 5

Level II Articulation Meetings
By Discipline Grouping
A.A. Program Review

Discipline Groupings	1987-88 Planned	1987-88 Conducted	1988-89 Planned	1988-89 Conducted	1989-90 Planned
Ag. Sci./Agribus./Ag. Prod.	1			10	2
Allied Health		4	1	5	3
Arch. & Environ. Design	1	1		2	2
Business Management	35	27	16	23	21
Commun. & Commun. Tech.	11	7	8	12	8
Computer & Info. Science	7	13	14	10	9
Education	16	11	25	20	20
Eng. & Eng. Related Tech.	18	11	6	10	7
Foreign Lang./Area & Ethnic Studies	4	8	8	14	4
Health Science	3	12	3	13	6
Home Economics	1	1		3	1
Law			2	1	
Letters	12	21	17	14	8
Lib./Gen. & Multi/Interdis. Studies	1	8	7	6	7
Library & Archival Science		1			
Life Sciences	13	16	15	22	15
Mathematics	18	25	27	22	8
Parks & Rec. Management					
Philosophy, Rel., & Theo.		1		3	1
Physical Sciences	15	20	14	23	14
Psychology	10	1	2	4	4
Pub. Affairs/Protect. Serv.	1	6	2	9	5
Renew. Nat. Res. (Forestry)					
Social Sciences	11	23	13	21	13
Visual & Performing Arts	8	11	8	9	7
Unclassified					
All	5	2	5	24	7
Totals	191	230	193	280	172

planned and the number conducted over three years according to discipline grouping. Table 6 groups the number of meetings by university. In 1988-89, 280 articulation meetings were conducted, fifty more than in 1987-88. The meetings did not tend to concentrate on a few of the discipline groupings, but were distributed unevenly over twenty-two of the twenty-five groupings. On the other hand, the meetings did tend to concentrate on one university. Both years, twice as many articulation meetings were with Florida State University as with any other university.

According to the reports of articulation meetings conducted, the meetings tend to be of two types. One type is general purpose interaction, often without faculty involvement. For example, several of the community colleges reported the annual, statewide two plus two conference. The second type is program specific, involving curriculum and instruction matters.

The information provided in the reports of articulation meetings conducted includes narrative statements of the results of the meetings and of the needs that should be recognized by the State Board of Community Colleges. Appendix 6 contains a summary of the results of 1987-88 and 1988-89 meetings, and appendix 7 contains a summary of the needs that should

TABLE 6

Level II Articulation Meetings
By University
A.A. Program Review

	1987-88		1988-89		1989-90
	Planned	Conducted	Planned	Conducted	Planned
FAMU	4	6	2	8	3
FAU	4	14	15	12	14
FIU	4	10	1	8	6
FSU	67	83	42	90	39
UCF	26	36	35	32	30
UF	36	26	27	40	21
UNF	14	7	8	10	12
USF	20	29	43	40	27
UWF	14	12	8	11	5
All	2	3	12	5	4
Other				24	11
Total	191	230	193	280	172

be recognized. The appendix 7 summary contains eighty-four items that raise many issues with which the State Board of Community Colleges has been and is dealing.

Six of the items in appendix 7 call attention to the costs of the Level II articulation meetings, which include travel and substitute instructor costs.

Teleconferences should be considered as an alternative to travel. Commentary in many of the reports of articulation meetings emphasize the curriculum and instruction benefits of such interaction. One of the findings of the science program review mentioned earlier is that most community college science faculty do not engage in regular articulation meetings. Also mentioned earlier was the belief of the task force that developed the model for program review that the articulation meetings are the single, most promising feature of the program review process. Taken together, these considerations suggest the need for encouragement through funding.

Recommendation 4.-- Recommend each community college recognize that the associate in arts degree program review Level II articulation meetings are appropriately defined as program development under Rule 6A-14.029(2), FAC, and qualify for staff and program development funds.

Fourteen of the items in appendix 7 relate to the transfer of credit from the community colleges to the state universities. The Level II articulation meetings provide good opportunities to discover problems with the transfer of credit, and the reports of the meetings include frequent mention of such problems. The community college relations officers of the state universities provide valued articulation services and have helped resolve many credit transfer problems.

State Board of Education Rule 6A-10.024(3), FAC, requires general education core credit to be accepted in transfer. Section 240.115(1)(b), Florida Statutes, requires credit to be accepted in transfer for equivalent courses in the Common Course Designation and Numbering System. The Articulation Coordinating Committee is a particularly appropriate body to resolve incorrect credit transfer policies. To do so, it must deal with specific, documented instances of violations of law or rule, and not with general assertions. Despite the above references and other references to problems with the transfer of credit, only one case has been taken to the Articulation Coordinating Committee in years.

Recommendation 5.-- Recommend the community colleges investigate assertions of incorrect transfer of credit policies to determine the facts, and submit the particulars to the Articulation Coordinating Committee when assertions are found to be correct.

Student Outcomes

Grades

In February, 1989, the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission produced a report of its study of general education in the community colleges and universities. One component of the study was the determination of the grade distributions in the community colleges and universities. On page sixty of the report is the conclusion, "Clearly, the large percentage of As and Bs given by the ten institutions supports the public criticism of grade inflation prevalent in postsecondary education institutions both nationally and in Florida."

The determination of grade distribution in the community colleges was based on the analysis of 110 transcripts from each of six of the twenty-eight community colleges. The transcripts used were those of students who had earned the associate in arts degree. Therefore, the sample used for the conclusion that was drawn was skewed. The sample was drawn from only those students in the open admissions institutions who persevered to achieve the associate in arts degree. The grades of such students obviously would be higher than the grades of a representative sample of all the students.

To determine an accurate grade distribution for this program review, twenty-six of the twenty-eight community colleges reported the number of each grade conferred during 1987-88 in the courses that are part of the associate in arts degree program. The total was 1,060,299 grades. The percentages were calculated and are displayed in appendix 4, item 9, for each discipline cluster and overall. The percentages for the writing and mathematics courses that meet the requirements in

Rule 6A-10.024, FAC, (the "Gordon rule") are displayed in addition.

Table 7 compares the grade distribution this program review discovered with the grade distribution produced by the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission. The program review grade distribution found much smaller percentages of As and Bs, larger percentages of Ds and Fs, and a much larger percentage of other grades such as pass/fail, W, and I. The high percentage of other grades may be attributed partly to the policies of the community colleges that allow students to withdraw from courses without receiving poor grades.

TABLE 7

Grade Frequency and Distribution

	A.A. Program Review		PEPC Study	
Grade	#	%	#	%
A	247,680	23.36%	6,108	37.9%
B	258,577	24.39%	5,829	36.2%
C	208,684	19.68%	3,441	21.4%
D	56,382	5.32%	415	2.6%
F	66,383	6.26%	75	.4%
Other*	222,593	20.99%	246	1.5%
Total	1,060,299	100.00%	16,114	100.0%

*Pass/Fail, W, I, etc.

The program review grade distribution found 48 percent above C, 20 percent Cs, and 32 percent below C.

In situations where grades are assigned "on the curve," it may be possible to reach agreement about the percentages of students to receive each grade. In situations where grades are assigned based on performance standards other than relative standing with the other students, it may be possible for even 100 percent of the students in a class to achieve the performance standards established for an A grade. Grade inflation, then, is a jargon term that confuses the real issue. Accusations about grade inflation actually are accusations about declining performance standards.

Whether 48 percent As and Bs is evidence of declining performance standards is impossible to determine without accounting and controlling for all the variables involved. Each community college must determine its own grade distribution and evaluate whether its grade distribution is appropriate considering all the variables at that institution. When the information in appendix 4, item 9 and in table 7 was calculated, the percentages of As and Bs at the twenty-six reporting colleges ranged from 34 percent to 64.2 percent. These high percentages create an impression that cannot be ignored. They must be investigated by the community colleges.

The norm in this country is for the classroom teacher to teach and then to assign grades indicating student performance. The separation of the two is not the general rule. Departmental examinations are not unusual, but they are not external evaluations. Other forms of achievement tests are not unusual, but they ordinarily do not result in course grades. The use of external evaluation to determine whether students pass their courses and to determine scores (grades) is much less common in the United States than in many other countries. Faculty from such countries are quick to ask how we handle quality control. To the extent that student achievement may partially depend on the teaching and to the extent that other pressures may influence grading, relying on the same person to teach, evaluate, and grade the same students could be argued as conflict of interest. This report does not propose a complete change to external evaluation. This report does propose that the community colleges recognize and deal with the question of grade inflation.

Recommendation 6.-- Recommend each community college monitor grade distributions and determine whether the grade distributions are consistent with the performance standards, instructional process, grading process, and other variables at that institution.

Graduation

In a community college system where enrollment increases rapidly, as in Florida, and where two-thirds of the students are part-time, as in Florida, determining graduation rates requires that students be tracked individually over time. A group of degree-seeking students is identified and tracked for a period of years. The graduation rate is the percentage of the group that has graduated by the end of the period agreed upon. Such a graduation rate has not been determined for the State Community College System, because the Community College Management Information System has been based on aggregate data rather than individual student data. The System is completing the process of converting to a student data base, after which the determination of systemwide graduation rates will be possible.

In 1986, Miami-Dade Community College published its findings after tracking first-time-in-college degree-seeking students individually and over time. After four years, 31 percent of the full-time students in the 1981 fall term cohort had graduated and 11 percent of the part-time students in the 1981 fall term cohort had graduated.

Recommendation 7.-- Recommend that as soon as the conversion of the Community College Management Information System to a student level data system is completed, the Division of Community Colleges begin a project of keeping track of the progress of students who are seeking the associate in arts degree to determine the percentages who graduate in various periods of time.

In the absence of a systemwide graduation rate, the State Community College System has computed a graduation index by dividing the number of associate in arts degrees conferred during a report year by the number of associate in arts degree-seeking students enrolled during the same report year. Table 8 displays five years of graduation information about the associate in arts degree program in the State Community College System. The information is displayed according to ethnic group and gender. In addition, the information is displayed for handicapped (physically or mentally impaired) students and disadvantaged (economically or academically) students. The reader must recognize that calculating graduation indexes by ethnic group, by gender, and by other groups frequently involves small numbers of students. In such cases, small variations in numbers can produce large variations in indexes.

The associate in arts degree program graduation index increased slowly and steadily over the last five years by .79 percentage points to the current index of approximately 11 percent. The male and female graduation indexes followed a similar pattern. The male graduation index exceeded the female index one of the five years, but averaged about one-half percentage point less than the female graduation index. Female graduates accounted for about 55 percent of the graduates each of the five years. So, the female graduation index exceeded the male graduation index, the female graduates

TABLE 8

Graduates and Graduation Indexes
By Ethnic Group and Gender
A.A. Degree Program

	1988-89		1987-88		1986-87		1985-86		1984-85	
	Number	Index	Number	Index	Number	Index	Number	Index	Number	Index
Alien (F)	199	16.95%	159	13.40%	166	15.44%	176	16.51%	166	13.66%
(M)	238	13.15	201	10.44	216	11.51	215	10.35	254	11.87
Asian (F)	182	11.87	94	7.83	104	9.82	86	9.57	81	9.00
(M)	145	8.93	109	8.06	120	9.98	95	8.90	82	7.55
Indian (F)	31	8.36	23	9.02	19	7.88	17	7.62	21	8.17
(M)	22	7.83	33	15.07	25	12.20	11	6.04	14	6.83
Black (F)	616	6.70	473	5.88	522	6.94	430	6.01	528	6.45
(M)	371	7.16	319	6.68	289	6.45	254	5.94	274	5.84
Hispanic (F)	1215	13.76	1035	13.29	1004	13.97	975	14.88	1028	15.27
(M)	1026	13.08	1027	14.42	843	12.46	736	11.91	768	11.97
White (F)	8503	11.04	7496	10.77	6556	10.61	6226	10.89	6333	10.11
(M)	6354	10.47	6027	10.87	5338	10.30	4768	9.98	5146	9.76
Female	10746	10.95	9280	10.54	8371	10.61	7910	10.83	8157	10.21
Male	8156	10.53	7716	10.89	6831	10.29	6079	9.88	6538	9.72
Total	18902	10.77	16996	10.70	15202	10.47	13989	10.39	14695	9.98
Handicapped	182	12.36	170	11.58	134	8.60	129	9.89	178	11.00
Disadvantaged	2206	6.38	1591	6.49	1568	5.72	1423	7.32	1697	5.75

outnumbered the male graduates, and the female enrollment outnumbered the male enrollment (table 1).

Black female graduates outnumbered black male graduates each of the last five years, but the black male graduation index increased slowly and steadily by 1.32 percentage points to exceed the black female index by .46 percentage points in 1988-89. Hispanic female graduates outnumbered Hispanic male graduates each of the last five years, and although the Hispanic male graduation index increased by 1.11 percentage points, it was still behind the Hispanic female graduation index by .68 percentage points in 1988-89. White female graduates outnumbered white male graduates each of the last five years, and although the white male graduation index increased by .71 percentage points, it was still behind the white female graduation index by .57 percentage points in 1988-89.

The graduation index for Hispanic students tended to be twice the index for black students and a couple of percentage points above the index for white students. Only the alien students had higher graduation indexes several of the five years.

Table 9 displays five years of graduation information about the associate in arts degree program, showing the numbers and percentages of graduates by ethnic group. Whites accounted for 78.60 percent of the

TABLE 9

Number and Percentage of Graduates
By Ethnic Group
A. A. Degree Program

	1988-89		1987-88		1986-87		1985-86		1984-85	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Alien	437	2.31%	360	2.12%	382	2.51%	391	2.80%	420	2.86%
Asian	327	1.73	203	1.19	224	1.47	181	1.29	163	1.11
Indian	53	.28	56	.33	44	.29	28	.20	35	.24
Black	987	5.22	792	4.66	811	5.34	684	4.89	802	5.46
Hispanic	2241	11.86	2062	12.13	1847	12.15	1711	12.23	1796	12.22
White	14857	78.60	13523	79.57	11894	78.24	10994	78.59	11479	78.11
Total	18902	100.00	16996	100.00	15202	100.00	13989	100.00	14695	100.00
Handicapped	182	.96	170	1.00	134	.88	129	.92	178	1.21
Disadvantaged	2206	11.67	1591	9.36	1568	10.31	1423	10.17	1697	11.55

associate in arts degree program graduates in 1988-89, Hispanics for 11.86 percent, and blacks for 5.22 percent. The proportion of the graduates in each ethnic group changed very little over the five years, and the little change was not consistently up or down. However, the net result at the end of the five years, in 1988-89, was slightly smaller proportions of black and Hispanic graduates.

Blacks who are eighteen and older comprise 11.78 percent of the Florida population. Blacks comprise 8.18 percent of the associate in arts degree program enrollment (table 2). Blacks account for only 5.22 percent of the associate in arts degrees. The overall graduation index for the associate in arts degree program is 10.77 percent, but the graduation index for blacks is 6.87 percent. These circumstances are despite the extensive equal access and equal opportunity efforts in the community colleges. Are the circumstances the same or better in vocational degree/certificate programs?

While blacks comprised 8.18 percent of the associate in arts degree enrollment in 1988-89, they comprised 9.50 percent of all degree/certificate enrollment in 1988-89. While blacks accounted for 5.22 percent of the associate in arts degree graduates in 1988-89, they accounted for 8.38 percent of all degree/certificate graduates in 1988-89. While the black graduation index for the associate in arts degree program was 6.87 percent in 1988-89, it was 11.16 percent for degree/certificate programs overall. So, circumstances of black participation are better in the vocational degree/certificate programs. But, it is through the associate in arts degree program, the road to the baccalaureate, that the much sought after goal of increasing black participation in the professions can be achieved.

Recommendation 8.-- Recommend that each community college recognize that black participation in the associate in arts degree program systemwide is less than black participation in degree/certificate programs overall, and investigate to determine whether that is true in their college. Recommend further that each community college that finds the systemwide condition reflected in their college adjust its equal access and equal opportunity plan to place additional emphasis on the associate in arts degree program.

Passing the College-Level Academic Skills Test is required for the associate in arts degree, and a larger percentage of black students than white students have difficulty passing the test. Each community college has developed and is carrying out an implementation plan that has been approved by the State Board of Community Colleges and the State Board of Education as the foundation for intensified efforts to assure that students are taught the skills measured on the College-Level Academic Skills Test, have learned the skills, and can demonstrate the skills. The implementation plans target minority students, and the concentrated efforts should result in higher passing rates, thereby increasing the black graduation index and encouraging black participation in the associate in arts degree program.

Transfer Rate

One of the issues agreed upon for the summative review of the associate in arts degree program was the question of what percentage of associate in arts degree graduates enter upper division programs and where. Since the associate in arts degree is the basic degree in community colleges for student transfer to upper division programs in the State University System, learning the extent to which the degree is used for that purpose was a necessary part of the program review.

Eighteen of the twenty-eight community colleges were able to respond to the item on the program review questionnaire that asked what percentage of the associate in arts degree graduates entered Florida public universities. See appendix 4, item 2.a. Discarding one response far outside the range of the other responses, the transfer rates reported for 1986-87 and 1987-88 ranged from 38 percent to 77 percent, with percentages in the seventies most frequent for 1986-87 and with percentages in the sixties most frequent for 1987-88.

Only ten of the colleges were able to respond to the item on the questionnaire that asked what percentage of the associate in arts degree graduates entered baccalaureate institutions outside the State University System. See appendix 4, item 2.b. The transfer rates reported for 1986-87 and 1987-88 ranged from 1 percent to 19 percent.

The community colleges can keep track of their graduates who enter the State University System by means of the data tapes available from that system. The colleges cannot easily keep track of their graduates who enter baccalaureate institutions outside the State University System. They must rely on such things as questionnaires mailed to graduates' last known addresses and requests for transcripts.

The dissertation study of R. Bruce Judd and the Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP) findings were mentioned in the student characteristics section of this chapter. Dr. Judd cited six studies, four of which were in Florida, that determined transfer rates. He found that transfer rates in Florida for the last decade were above 60 percent, which is fairly consistent with the findings from the program review questionnaire. FETPIP found that 63 percent of the 1988-89 associate in arts degree graduates transferred into the State University System.

The Level I program review data displays from which table 3 was developed include the number of associate in arts degree graduates who entered the State University System according to the upper division discipline groupings in which they enrolled. The number is a count of the students for whom records were sufficiently complete to be used in the Level I data display calculations. To obtain a more complete count of associate in arts degree graduates enrolled in the State University System, the State University System data tapes for 1986-87, 1987-88, and 1988-89 were searched for discipline group, ethnic group, and gender only. The findings are in appendix 8 and are summarized in table 10.

Table 10 shows that whites accounted for 80.56 percent of the associate in arts degree program graduates in the upper divisions of the State University System in 1988-89. Hispanics accounted for 10.86 percent, and blacks accounted for 4.84 percent. The white proportion increased steadily the three years in table 10 by 2.18 percentage points, but the Hispanic proportion decreased steadily by 1.06 percentage points and the black proportion decreased steadily by .64 percentage points.

TABLE 10

A.A. Degree Graduates
In SUS Upper Division
By Ethnic Group and Gender

	1988-89		1987-88		1986-87	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Alien	(M) 309		(M) 377		(M) 423	
	(F) 201		(F) 209		(F) 239	
	510	1.60	586	1.92	662	2.30
Asian	(M) 16		(M) 9		(M) 10	
	(F) 26		(F) 33		(F) 30	
	42	.13	42	.14	40	.14
Indian	(M) 352		(M) 303		(M) 291	
	(F) 287		(F) 255		(F) 221	
	639	2.01	558	1.83	512	1.78
Black	(M) 556		(M) 549		(M) 543	
	(F) 985		(F) 1025		(F) 1038	
	1541	4.84	1574	5.15	1581	5.48
Hispanic	(M) 1613		(M) 1598		(M) 1613	
	(F) 1848		(F) 1848		(F) 1821	
	3461	10.86	3446	11.28	3434	11.92
White	(M) 11541		(M) 11004		(M) 10440	
	(F) 14125		(F) 13326		(F) 12147	
	25666	80.56	24330	79.68	22587	78.38
Total	(M) 14387		(M) 13840		(M) 13320	
	(F) 17472		(F) 16696		(F) 15496	
	31859	100.00	31536	100.00	28816	100.00

The enrollment of other ethnic group students shown in table 10 was small in number. Aliens accounted for 1.60 percent, Asians accounted for .13 percent, and Indians accounted for 2.01 percent. The Indian proportion increased steadily the three years in table 10 by .23 percentage points, the Asian proportion remained basically the same, and the alien proportion decreased steadily by .70 percentage points.

Nontransfer Uses of the Degree

The information in the transfer rate section of this chapter reveals that perhaps as many as one-third of the associate in arts degree graduates do not use the degree to transfer to upper division baccalaureate programs. Does the degree have a value of its own in the labor market? R. Bruce Judd, whose dissertation study has been referenced before in this report, found that it does. In fact, Dr. Judd contends that his findings show, "that during the first eight years following graduation from a community college, the associate in arts degree has a distinct value in the labor market and in some enterprises in the state of Florida it has a value equal to or greater than that of the baccalaureate degree."

The associate in arts degree is designed as the basis for transfer to the upper divisions in the State University System. Perhaps as many as one-third of the graduates use the degree for a different purpose. If the purpose is for its value in the labor market, the evidence is that purpose is achieved.

With respect to other possible purposes, personal enrichment for example, it may be well to consider the distinction between the degree program and its component parts. The degree program is a combination of courses in a planned package that produces a defined product beyond the sum of the courses and requires the conferring of the degree to signify that product. That distinguishes the degree program from the simple accumulation of courses. For the former, the degree is an essential part of the record, because the degree has meaning beyond the student transcript. For the latter, a separate award is not necessary, because it would have no meaning beyond the transcript record of courses accumulated. This logic applies to the occasional question raised about the possibility of a "general purpose" degree.

College-Level Academic Skills Test

Passing the College-Level Academic Skills Test is required for the associate in arts degree. It is an achievement test that measures the attainment of community college and university students of the communication and mathematics skills identified by the faculties of the colleges and universities through the College-Level Academic Skills Program. The test consists of subtests in mathematics, reading, English language skills, and writing (essay). With the possible exception of logic and statistics, the skills are taught in the high school courses available in the ninth and tenth grades. See table 11.

TABLE 11

CLAST Skills Areas

Mathematics	Reading	English Language Skills	Essay
Arithmetic	Literal Comprehension	Word Choice	Writing Skills
Algebra	Critical Comprehension	Sentence Structure	
Geometry		Grammar	
Measurement		Spelling	
Logic		Capitalization	
Statistics		Punctuation	

Table 12 shows the percentages of the community college students with at least sixty credits who passed the College-Level Academic Skills Test the first time they took it for each test administration since the first time it was administered in October, 1982. For the first six administrations, associate in arts degree program students were required to take the test, but were not required to achieve minimum passing scores. Beginning with the September, 1984 administration, associate in arts degree program students were required to achieve minimum passing scores to earn the associate in arts degree. The minimum passing scores were increased in September, 1986 and in October, 1989.

Before the September, 1986 increase in the minimum

TABLE 12

CLAST Pass Rates
First-Time Examinees with 60 or More Credits

Test Date	Percentage Passed				
	Math	Reading	Eng Lang Skills	Essay	All Subtests
October 1982	88.2	86.3	90.2	74.2	64.0
March 1983	88.9	88.9	92.7	80.5	70.0
June 1983	87.6	84.9	90.9	78.0	65.7
October 1983	90.4	96.7	89.9	78.7	70.8
March 1984	96.7	94.1	95.3	89.3	84.2
June 1984	91.9	82.1	94.7	88.0	73.5
September 1984	98.1	95.2	96.1	88.3	84.1
March 1985	97.5	98.0	96.3	92.8	89.3
June 1985	97.3	97.2	94.6	92.2	87.9
October 1985	98.0	94.3	95.3	90.4	84.9
March 1986	97.0	97.2	96.5	91.7	87.9
June 1986	97.8	97.5	97.3	91.1	88.1
September 1986*	92.0	89.8	96.2	93.4	81.4
March 1987	92.8	91.5	94.9	92.7	82.3
June 1987	92.3	94.7	94.6	91.5	82.4
September 1987	94	95	97	90	83
March 1988	94	90	97	91	81
June 1988	89	93	95	91	80
October 1988	87	95	95	90	79
March 1989	92	97	97	91	85
June 1989	90	95	96	94	84
October 1989*	82	87	80	91	65
March 1990	76	82	75	90	59
June 1990	81	77	78	90	61

*Passing standards were increased September, 1986 and October, 1989.

passing scores, students took the College-Level Academic Skills Test for the first time during the semester in which they were registered for their sixtieth credit. From September, 1986 through June, 1990, students were eligible to take the test any time it was administered. Effective October, 1990, students are eligible to take the test for the first time after they have earned eighteen credits. Because of the changes in eligibility, in order to obtain a comparable population, table 12 was developed to show the passing rates for students who had sixty credits when they took the test for the first time.

The pass rates in table 12 increased, then leveled off, then declined. The pass rates were affected by the September, 1986 and the October, 1989 increases in the minimum passing scores. Table 13 was prepared to allow comparison of the mean scores over the last four years on the College-Level Academic Skills Test independent of the pass rates. However, mean scores were not available for some test administrations for the group of first-time examinees with sixty or more credits. Therefore, table 13 covers all first-time examinees.

Except for the reading subtest, the mean scores in table 13 decreased the last three of the four years in the table. The improvement in student performance on the College-Level Academic Skills Test during the early years of the test appears to have stopped and may be

TABLE 13

CLAST Mean Scores
First-Time Examinees

Test Date	Math	Reading	Eng. Lang. Skills	Essay
September, 1986	308	309	320	5.0
March, 1987	311	313	319	5.1
June, 1987	309	315	311	5.0
September, 1987	310	311	319	4.8
March, 1988	310	309	318	4.8
June, 1988	307	308	314	4.9
October, 1988	301	313	311	4.7
March, 1989	307	318	316	4.8
June, 1989	305	313	314	4.9
October, 1989	303	316	313	4.7
March, 1990	298	315	313	4.7
June, 1990	302	311	312	4.7

reversing. The inclusion the last three years of the scores of students with less than sixty credits may have been a factor.

Students are allowed to retake the subtests of the College-Level Academic Skills Test until they pass them. Studies done by the Standing Committee on Student Achievement of the Articulation Coordinating Committee show that students do retake and do pass the subtests they failed initially. Table 14 displays some of the committee's findings. Of the university and community college students who took the test March, 1988, 82.5 percent passed all four subtests. Following the students who failed through five more administrations of the test found a success rate that increased the 82.5 percent initial pass rate to 95.4 percent.

TABLE 14

CLAST Cumulative Pass Rates
March 1988 Cohort Through Six Administrations
Community College and University

Test Date	Math	Reading	Eng Lang Skills	Essay	All Subtests
March 1988	93.2	91.2	97.0	91.5	82.5
June 1988	94.7	94.7	97.8	93.9	87.9
October 1988	95.7	96.6	98.4	95.6	91.2
March 1989	96.6	97.6	98.7	96.6	93.5
June 1989	96.9	97.9	98.9	96.6	94.1
October 1989	97.5	98.7	99.4	97.6	95.4

During the last two years, partly due to regularly scheduled review and partly due to the anticipated, then actual, impact of the October, 1989 increase in minimum passing scores, the monitoring of student performance on the College-Level Academic Skills Test and the review of the test intensified significantly. There were contracted studies and evaluations, internal studies and evaluations, statewide coordinated reviews, task forces, and workshops. Recommendations for improving student performance, particularly the performance of minority students, were made by the State Board of Community Colleges and by various task forces, and are being implemented according to implementation plans developed by the community colleges and by the Department of Education. The community college implementation plans were discussed earlier in the section on graduation.

When the results of the October, 1989 administration of the College-Level Academic Skills Test became available, the anticipated impact of the new minimum passing scores became real. The pass rates dropped as shown in table 12. Of particular concern is the impact on black students and on Hispanic students who account for about 8 percent and 9 percent respectively of the associate in arts degree program enrollment (table 2). Their mean scores and pass rates are shown in table 15.

The College-Level Academic Skills Test measures the achievement of English and mathematics skills that all associate in arts degree and baccalaureate degree graduates should have as agreed upon by the community college and university faculties. If the students have completed their required English courses satisfactorily,

TABLE 15

CLAST Mean Scores and Pass Rates
Black and Hispanic First-Time Examinees

	Math		Reading		Eng Lang Skills		Essay		All Subtests
Test Date	Mean	Pass Rate	Mean	Pass Rate	Mean	Pass Rate	Mean	Pass Rate	Pass Rate
				Black Students					
Sept 1987	291	81%	289	81%	299	89%	3.8	67%	54%
Mar 1988	290	74	283	62	298	89	3.8	69	44
June 1988	286	64	285	71	294	84	4.1	76	44
Oct 1988	281	54	288	76	294	84	4.0	73	42
Mar 1989	286	67	298	85	299	88	4.0	73	52
June 1989	282	60	291	78	296	86	4.1	76	44
Oct 1989	282	48	297	59	295	52	4.0	74	27
Mar 1990	275	33	293	43	296	44	3.9	70	17
June 1990	280	43	289	38	293	46	3.9	73	19
				Hispanic Students					
Sept 1987	307	91%	302	94%	309	95%	4.5	85%	75%
Mar 1988	305	88	297	80	306	93	4.3	82	64
June 1988	301	82	297	89	299	87	4.4	84	65
Oct 1988	293	74	299	87	298	86	4.2	78	59
Mar 1989	301	82	308	92	305	93	4.2	79	66
June 1989	297	79	302	87	301	89	4.4	85	64
Oct 1989	293	62	306	71	300	62	4.2	78	38
Mar 1990	283	46	300	54	297	49	4.0	71	27
June 1990	292	60	296	51	297	52	4.1	76	31

they should be able to demonstrate the English skills. If the students have completed their required mathematics courses satisfactorily, they should be able to demonstrate the mathematics skills.

On the June, 1990 administration of the College-Level Academic Skills Test, 57 percent of the black first-time examinees did not pass the mathematics subtest, 40 percent of the Hispanic first-time examinees did not pass the mathematics subtest, and 18 percent of the white first-time examinees did not pass the mathematics subtest. That should not happen with students who have satisfactorily completed mathematics courses that taught the skills tested on the mathematics subtest, and who were required to demonstrate the achievement of the skills before being given passing grades in the courses.

Recommendation 9.-- Recommend that each community college board of trustees require the necessary curriculum adjustments to be made in its required English and mathematics courses for the associate in arts degree to include all the skills listed in Rule 6A-10.0310, FAC; and require all of the instructors of those courses to teach the skills; and require a procedure to be installed and applied to assure that the skills are taught.

In concert with assurance that the skills measured on the College-Level Academic Skills Test are included in the required English and mathematics courses is the reasonable expectation of the community colleges that there be sufficient funding to enable them to provide the intensive teaching that is necessary for many community college students to learn the skills. The section on class size in this report contains the finding that the average class size in the courses generally designed to include the skills is about twenty-six students. Each legislature for years has stated in the General Appropriations Act the objective to reduce English and mathematics class sizes to twenty-two students, but it cannot be done without additional funds.

On the June, 1990 College-Level Academic Skills Test, 39 percent of the first-time examinees with sixty or more credits failed at least one of the subtests. The cost of providing the instructional services to help these students pass on subsequent attempts is high, but table 14 shows that they can pass. Many of the services are labor intensive. They involve identification, diagnosis, individual prescription, personal contact and treatment, a wide variety of methods and materials, and progress tracking. The high cost of providing these services should be recognized in legislative appropriations.

Recommendation 10.-- Recommend support of the additional legislative funding requested in the 1991-93 legislative budget request to enable each community college to provide instructional designs and services to improve the teaching and learning of the English and mathematics knowledge and skills measured on the College-Level Academic Skills Test.

Program Effectiveness Measures

Program effectiveness measures is a timely topic of general interest nationally as well as in Florida. The new institutional effectiveness criteria of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools have contributed to the stimulation of interest. The chief instructional officers of the Florida community colleges scheduled a June, 1990 conference on program review and institutional effectiveness, which attracted two hundred faculty and administrators from community colleges, universities, and area vocational-technical centers.

Item eleven on the program review questionnaire asked which measures of the effectiveness of the associate in arts degree program are used by the community colleges. See appendix 4, item 11.

The associate in arts degree program is effective if it simply does what it is supposed to do. Effectiveness cannot be determined without knowing what the program is supposed to do. Twenty-one of the twenty-eight community colleges indicated that they define the educational results that they expect from the program. Seventeen of the colleges indicated that they specify how achievement of the expected educational results is to be determined. Twelve indicated that they specify how their findings about program effectiveness are used.

The most common measures of effectiveness that were indicated were scores on standardized or locally constructed examinations and the performance of graduates in upper division programs. They were indicated by twenty-seven community colleges. One college reported that it measured changes in student values. Other measures indicated were peer evaluation, interviews, surveys, pre- and post-tests, continuous institutional research, and departmental reviews.

Enrollment Trends

Table 16 shows the six-year pattern of full-time equivalent student enrollment (FTE) in courses classified as advanced and professional, postsecondary vocational, and postsecondary adult vocational. The advanced and professional classification is for baccalaureate lower division courses. All the courses in associate in arts degree programs are advanced and professional. The postsecondary vocational classification is for the job-related courses in associate in science degree programs. The postsecondary adult vocational classification is for the job-related courses in vocational certificate programs offered in area vocational education school departments in community colleges.

There was a systemwide decrease in full-time

TABLE 16

Full-Time Equivalent Student Enrollment Trends

	Advanced and Professional	Postsecondary Vocational	Postsecondary Adult Vocational
1984-85	66,636	35,290	9,649
1985-86	66,007	33,990	9,144
1986-87	70,244	33,372	8,840
1987-88	76,666	33,321	9,208
1988-89	83,060	34,935	9,407
1989-90	91,462	36,972	11,062

equivalent student enrollment in 1985-86 in all three of the course classifications in table 16. The following year, advanced and professional FTE recovered and even increased over 1984-85. The postsecondary vocational FTE and the postsecondary adult vocational FTE did not recover completely until 1989-90.

In the five years since 1984-85, advanced and professional FTE increased 37 percent although it decreased 1 percent the first year. Over the same period, postsecondary vocational FTE increased 5 percent although it decreased 6 percent the first three years. The postsecondary adult vocational FTE increased 15 percent although it decreased 8 percent the first two years.

From the lowest points in the six years, advanced and professional FTE increased 39 percent during the last four years. Postsecondary vocational FTE increased 11 percent during the last two years. Postsecondary adult vocational FTE increased 25 percent during the last three years.

During the six-year period from 1984-85 through 1989-90, full-time equivalent student enrollment decreased, then increased. Associate in arts degree program FTE decreased far less than and for fewer years than associate in science degree program FTE and vocational certificate program FTE. Associate in arts degree program FTE rebounded sooner than and at a higher rate than associate in science degree program FTE and vocational certificate program FTE.

While table 16 presented full-time equivalent student enrollment for three classifications of courses, table 17 presents the number of students (headcount) in the associate in arts degree programs, the associate in science degree programs, and the vocational certificate programs, and does so according to ethnic group and gender.

There was a systemwide decrease in student headcount enrollment in 1985-86 in all three of the program categories in table 17. By 1987-88, the

TABLE 17

Program Enrollment Trends

		Associate in Arts					Associate in Science					Vocational Certificate				
		84-85	85-86	86-87	87-88	88-89	84-85	85-86	86-87	87-88	88-89	84-85	85-86	86-87	87-88	88-89
Alien	(M)	2188	2078	1865	1925	1810	540	500	449	398	386	37	32	21	18	18
	(F)	1244	1066	1089	1187	1174	509	504	472	476	477	11	15	10	14	17
Asian	(M)	1119	1068	1196	1353	1623	439	397	400	417	441	98	125	116	111	161
	(F)	944	899	1067	1201	1533	400	400	402	404	464	51	71	83	60	57
Indian	(M)	218	182	201	219	281	115	95	88	88	111	53	39	37	29	31
	(F)	273	223	246	255	371	137	128	123	137	176	27	23	85	21	32
Black	(M)	4848	4278	4451	4778	5183	2414	2027	1965	1840	1899	1347	1252	1101	1108	1255
	(F)	8470	7154	7567	8048	9188	4671	3924	4109	4148	4284	1135	1261	1369	1204	1449
Hispanic	(M)	6471	6181	6740	7120	7844	2153	2039	2107	2224	2403	144	133	160	158	164
	(F)	6793	6553	7217	7789	8827	2878	2788	2957	2890	3139	120	90	126	120	124
White	(M)	55302	47755	51336	55427	60708	21851	18508	17910	17662	17563	5489	5431	5580	5654	5051
	(F)	65751	57173	62360	69582	77009	30328	26970	26078	25836	26457	3893	3631	4129	3369	3128
Total	(M)	70146	61542	65789	70822	77449	27512	23566	22919	22629	22803	7168	7012	7015	7078	6680
	(F)	83475	73068	79546	88062	98102	38923	34714	34141	33891	34997	5237	5091	5752	4788	4807
Total		153621	134610	145335	158884	175551	66435	58280	57060	56520	57800	12405	12103	12767	11866	11487

associate in arts degree program headcount had recovered and even increased over 1984-85. The associate in science degree program headcount continued to decrease until 1988-89, but remained well below 1984-85. The vocational certificate program headcount recovered in 1986-87, then declined again the last two years in table 17.

In the four years after 1984-85 recorded in table 17, associate in arts degree program headcount enrollment increased 14 percent although it decreased 12 percent the first year. Over the same period, associate in science degree program headcount was down 13 percent. Vocational certificate program headcount was down 7 percent. Recognize that table 17 does not report 1989-90, but table 16 does.

Table 18 was prepared to show the proportions of the enrollment in the categories in tables 16 and 17. Since table 17 does not report 1989-90, neither does table 18. However, the 1989-90 FTE enrollment in table 16 is 9 percent larger than 1988-89, and adheres to the description in the next paragraph.

Of the FTE enrollment reported in table 18, the percentage classified as advanced and professional increased and the percentages classified as postsecondary vocational and postsecondary adult vocational decreased. Of the headcount enrollment reported in table 18, the

TABLE 18

Enrollment Proportions
Of Selected Categories
Trends

	1984-85		1988-89	
	#	%	#	%
FTE				
Advanced & Professional	66,636	59.7	83,060	65.2
Postsecondary Vocational	35,290	31.6	34,935	27.4
Postsecondary Adult Voc.	9,649	8.7	9,407	7.4
Total	111,575	100.0	127,402	100.0
Headcount				
Associate in Arts	153,621	66.1	175,551	71.7
Associate in Science	66,435	28.6	57,800	23.6
Vocational Certificate	12,405	5.3	11,487	4.7
Total	232,461	100.0	244,838	100.0

percentage in associate in arts degree programs increased and the percentages in associate in science degree and vocational certificate programs decreased. Advanced and professional FTE was 65 percent of the total in 1988-89, and associate in arts degree program headcount was 71.7 percent of the total in 1988-89.

These enrollment findings show that full-time equivalent student enrollment in advanced and professional courses accounts for two-thirds of the enrollment in courses that apply to degrees and certificates. Student headcount enrollment in associate in arts degree programs approaches three-fourths of the enrollment in degree and certificate programs. FTE enrollment in advanced and professional courses and headcount enrollment in associate in arts degree programs are increasing more consistently and rapidly than in vocational courses and programs.

Table 17 displayed student headcount enrollment in degree and certificate programs according to gender. In 1988-89, 56.3 percent of the overall headcount was female, 55.9 percent of the associate in arts headcount was female, 60.5 percent of the associate in science headcount was female, and 41.8 percent of the vocational certificate headcount was female. Except in vocational certificate programs, females outnumbered the males, and the extent of their majority increased during the five years in table 17.

Considering Hispanic students alone, in 1988-89, 52.5 percent of the associate in arts headcount was female, 56.6 percent of the associate in science headcount was female, and 43.1 percent of the vocational certificate headcount was female. Except in vocational certificate programs, Hispanic females outnumbered the males during the five years in table 17.

Considering black students alone, in 1988-89, 63.9 percent of the associate in arts headcount was female, 69.3 percent of the associate in science headcount was female, and 53.6 percent of the vocational certificate headcount was female. Black females outnumbered the males during the five years in table 17, even in vocational certificate programs three of the five years. The extent of their majority was from eight to ten percentage points higher than the total female majority.

These enrollment findings regarding gender show that female students outnumber male students in degree programs and the extent of their majority has been increasing. Among black students, the female majority is especially high, practically 70 percent in associate in science degree programs.

Table 19 contains student headcount enrollment in degree and certificate programs according to ethnic group, and shows the percentages of the total headcount from each ethnic group. There is a larger percentage of black students in associate in science programs than in associate in arts programs, and a much larger percentage in vocational certificate programs. There is a smaller percentage of Hispanic students in vocational certificate programs than in associate in science or associate in arts programs. In this respect, the patterns of black

TABLE 19

Program Enrollment by Ethnic Group
Number and Percentage
Trends

	Associate in Arts					Associate in Science					Vocational Certificate				
	84-85	85-86	86-87	87-88	88-89	84-85	85-86	86-87	87-88	88-89	84-85	85-86	86-87	87-88	88-89
Headcount															
Alien	3432	3144	2954	3112	2984	1049	1004	921	874	863	48	47	31	32	35
Asian	2063	1967	2263	2554	3156	839	797	802	821	905	149	196	199	171	218
Indian	491	405	447	474	652	252	223	211	225	287	80	62	72	50	63
Black	13318	11432	12018	12826	14371	7085	5951	6074	5988	6183	2482	2513	2470	2312	2704
Hispanic	13264	12734	13957	14909	16671	5031	4827	5064	5114	5542	264	223	286	278	288
White	121053	104928	113696	125009	137717	52179	45478	43988	43498	44020	9382	9062	9709	9023	8179
Total	153621	134610	145335	158884	175551	66435	58280	57060	56520	57800	12405	12103	12767	11866	11487
Percentage															
Alien	2.24	2.34	2.03	1.96	1.70	1.58	1.72	1.61	1.55	1.49	.39	.39	.24	.27	.30
Asian	1.34	1.46	1.56	1.61	1.80	1.26	1.37	1.41	1.45	1.56	1.20	1.62	1.56	1.44	1.90
Indian	.32	.30	.31	.30	.37	.38	.38	.37	.40	.50	.64	.51	.56	.42	.55
Black	8.67	8.49	8.27	8.07	8.18	10.67	10.21	10.65	10.59	10.70	20.01	20.76	19.35	19.49	23.54
Hispanic	8.63	9.46	9.60	9.38	9.50	7.57	8.28	8.87	9.05	9.59	2.13	1.84	2.24	2.34	2.51
White	78.80	77.95	78.23	78.68	78.45	78.54	78.04	77.09	76.96	76.16	75.63	74.88	76.05	76.04	71.20
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

student and Hispanic student enrollment are just the opposite.

In all three categories of program in table 19, the percentages of alien students and of white students have declined slightly while the percentages of Asian students and of Hispanic students have increased slightly. The percentage of black students in associate in arts programs has declined slightly.

Table 20 compares the proportions of black, Hispanic, and white students enrolled in the three categories of degree and certificate programs in 1988-89 with the proportions of black, Hispanic, and white high school graduates the preceding year. Black students in degree programs, especially the associate in arts degree programs, account for a noticeably smaller percentage of the enrollment than their percentage among high school graduates. Black students in vocational certificate programs, on the other hand, account for a larger percentage of the enrollment than their percentage among high school graduates.

Hispanic students in degree programs account for a slightly larger percentage of the enrollment than their percentage among high school graduates. Hispanic students in vocational certificate programs account for a noticeably smaller percentage of the enrollment than their percentage among high school graduates.

TABLE 20

Selected Ethnic Group Representation Comparisons
H. S. Graduates/Degree and Certificate Enrollment

	1987-88 H. S. Diplomas	1988-89 A. A. Program	1988-89 A. S. Program	1988-89 Voc. Cert. Program
Black	17.47%	8.18%	10.70%	23.54%
Hispanic	8.26%	9.50%	9.59%	2.51%
White	72.64%	78.45%	76.16%	71.20%

The conclusion drawn from those enrollment findings regarding ethnic groups is that black students, especially black males, are underrepresented in the associate in arts degree program, and that Hispanic students are well represented. This circumstance regarding black students is despite the extensive equal access and equal opportunity efforts in the community colleges. As stated in connection with recommendation eight, it is through the associate in arts degree program, the road to the baccalaureate, that the much sought after goal of increasing black participation in the professions can be achieved. The findings in this section add support to recommendation eight.

Curriculum and Instruction

College Preparatory Instruction

College preparatory instruction is the term applied to precollege-level instruction to remedy deficiencies in the knowledge and skills judged necessary for entry into college credit courses. First-time-in-college, degree-seeking students are required to be tested prior to the completion of registration. If they do not demonstrate a specified minimum level of performance, they are required to enroll in college preparatory instruction to remedy their deficiencies.

The open admissions policy for the State Community College System means that students are welcome even if they did not take courses to prepare for college while they were in high school. Students who graduated from high school years before are welcome even though the longer they wait after high school graduation, the more may be forgotten. Providing such an opportunity for students necessarily means that the need for college preparatory instruction will be extensive, and it is.

Table 21 shows the results of entry-level testing to determine the need for college preparatory instruction in mathematics, reading, and writing. The tests authorized are the ACT and the ASSET from the American College Testing Program and the SAT and the MAPS from The College Board. The number of students tested is shown, and the number and percentage that scored below the score standards established in State Board of Education rule are shown. The table shows the testing results for each

TABLE 21

College Preparatory Testing Results

	Mathematics			Reading			Writing		
		< Standard			< Standard			< Standard	
Test	#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%
				1985-86					
ACT	12214	5754	47%	12195	4645	38%	12184	4352	36%
SAT	4687	1548	33%	4670	1055	23%	2895	528	18%
ASSET	3889	2074	53%	4407	1166	26%	4415	1785	40%
MAPS	21741	13035	60%	22501	7128	32%	22588	8685	38%
Total	42531	22411	53%	43773	13994	32%	42082	15350	36%
				1986-87					
ACT	14305	6565	46%	14286	4745	33%	14300	4235	30%
SAT	8240	2499	30%	8195	1764	22%	6638	981	15%
ASSET	13847	9570	69%	17352	4763	27%	16407	5727	35%
MAPS	29077	14695	51%	28403	7359	26%	28263	8945	32%
Total	65469	33329	51%	68236	18631	27%	65608	19888	30%
				1987-88					
ACT	11537	4792	42%	11691	3496	30%	11733	3102	26%
SAT	7406	2157	29%	7867	1472	19%	6942	847	12%
ASSET	9514	6997	74%	10722	2909	27%	10713	3713	35%
MAPS	34516	17470	51%	33903	7981	24%	33487	9730	29%
Total	62973	31416	50%	64183	15858	25%	62875	17392	28%
				1988-89					
ACT	11349	4867	43%	11294	3374	30%	11196	2839	25%
SAT	8838	2324	26%	8921	1429	16%	8156	831	10%
ASSET	8606	6214	72%	9362	2271	24%	9303	2801	30%
MAPS	39080	19168	49%	38918	9595	25%	38605	10983	28%
Total	67873	32573	48%	68495	16669	24%	67260	17454	26%

of four years, 1985-86 through 1988-89.

The percentages of students who do not achieve the score standards in rule produce the reliable conclusion that approximately half the students tested need remediation in mathematics, a fourth of the students need remediation in reading, and a fourth of the students need remediation in writing. As stated earlier, the open admissions policy and the characteristics of many students who select community colleges mean that the need for college preparatory instruction is and will continue to be significant in extent and importance. That aspect of the community college mission makes an extraordinary contribution to the economic well-being and the quality of life of the individual, the community, and the state.

The cost of providing the college preparatory instruction to help these students remediate their deficiencies is high. Many of the instructional services are labor intensive. They involve identification, diagnosis, individual prescription, personal contact and treatment, a wide variety of methods and materials, and progress tracking. The high cost of providing these services should be recognized in legislative appropriations.

Recommendation 11.-- Recommend support of the additional legislative funding requested in the 1991-93 legislative budget request to enable the community colleges to provide college preparatory instruction to remediate the academic deficiencies of their students to the extent of the need.

The summative review of the associate in arts degree program did not find information to indicate how many of the students who need college preparatory instruction had completed high school courses to prepare them for college and had entered the community colleges directly after high school graduation. Such information is necessary. Charges that our public schools do not prepare students adequately are found regularly in newspapers and magazines and are heard regularly in broadcasts, in conversations, and in meetings of educators and of noneducators. There is ample evidence that our public school students and graduates in general perform less well than students from many other countries, and that employers find them inadequately prepared. The report of the Florida Task Force to Improve Mathematics, Science, and Computer Education listed in the literature review section of this report cites such evidence. But, our specific concern on this point is not with public school students in general. It is with the students who follow a curriculum to prepare them for college and who enter the community colleges without delay after high school graduation. To what extent do they need college preparatory instruction?

Recommendation 12.-- Recommend the Division of Community Colleges conduct a study to determine the proportion of the students who need college preparatory instruction who completed public school courses to prepare them for college and who entered a community college without delay after high school graduation.

The junior high/middle school and senior high school faculties and curriculum coordinators who design and teach the courses to prepare students for college and guidance counselors who advise the students should know and understand the community college associate in arts degree programs and prerequisites. To increase the proportion of entering students who are properly prepared, community college faculty should express their entry level expectations. Direct and regular interaction between community college faculty and junior high/middle school and senior high school faculty, curriculum coordinators, and guidance counselors is as important as the interaction achieved through the Level II program review articulation meetings discussed in the community college/university faculty interaction section of this report.

Recommendation 13.-- Recommend that community colleges schedule, on at least an annual basis, formal meetings between their associate in arts degree program faculty and district junior high/middle school and senior high school faculty, curriculum coordinators, and guidance counselors to discuss college entry level expectations, student performance, and curriculum. Further, recommend that informal opportunities for such interaction be pursued year-round.

The State University System has a high school course distribution requirement for admission. It has a list of courses it recommends that high school students take to meet the course distribution requirement. The State Board of Community Colleges endorsed the course distribution and list of courses on April 6, 1990, and recommends them for high school students preparing to attend the community colleges.

The high school courses that should be taken by high school students who plan to attend college should be taken by students who plan to attend community colleges as well as by students who plan to attend the state universities or other competitive admissions baccalaureate institutions. Students who take courses to prepare for college while they are in high school should do well enough on the entry-level tests to avoid taking college preparatory instruction at the community colleges before attempting the college credit courses. They should be prepared to go directly into the English and mathematics courses required for the degree, thereby saving money, time, and effort.

Recommendation 14.-- Recommend that community colleges advise the high schools in their districts that the courses and course distribution recommended by the State University System for college bound high school students also is recommended by the State Community College System. Further, recommend that appropriate community college publications and Department of Education publications include the courses and course distribution detail.

Table 21 and the data from which the table was compiled show that the MAPS test from The College Board is the most used of the four entry-level examinations. Table 21 also shows that the percentages of students who fail to achieve the score standards have decreased steadily since 1985-1986; five percentage points in mathematics, eight percentage points in reading, and ten percentage points in writing. A parallel trend is not found in the proportion of college preparatory instruction enrollment to college credit instruction enrollment.

When alternative examinations are authorized for college preparatory testing, the examinations must be comparable and the score standards must be comparable. In other words, the examinations must measure basically the same thing and it must not be easier to achieve the score standard on one examination than on another. If the comparability exists and the populations tested are not skewed significantly, the percentages of students who do not achieve the score standards should be similar. The percentage variations within the twelve cells in table 21 range from a high of forty-six percentage points to a low of eleven percentage points. The largest variations are in mathematics and the smallest variations are in reading. The percentages are so dissimilar that it is tempting to conclude that the score standards are not comparable and to wonder whether the examinations are comparable. The Department of Education Strategy Planning and MIS Office and Assessment, Testing, and Evaluation Office have found that the score standards are not comparable, and that they sort students differently.

Recommendation 15.-- Recommend the Articulation Coordinating Committee proceed with modifications to Rule 6A-10.0315, FAC, to make comparable the score standards therein for college preparatory testing.

Community college personnel tend to have such a deep commitment to open admissions and equal access that they are reluctant to place what might be considered by students as obstacles between the students and their educational objectives. Forcing students to remedy deficiencies in knowledge and skills before they enroll in courses that depend on their having the knowledge and skills upon entry is viewed by some personnel as an obstacle, and by others as a facilitating step toward the students' objectives.

Specifying and enforcing prerequisite knowledge and skills carries with it the responsibility of assuring that the knowledge and skills really constitute an essential prior condition, and of accurately measuring the absence or presence of the knowledge and skills. The identification of the skills to be measured by the College-Level Academic Skills Test and the subsequent development of the test followed an extremely rigorous procedure with extraordinary involvement of teaching faculty. The identification of essential college entry-level knowledge and skills and the development of an entry-level testing instrument should be no less rigorous.

Recommendation 16.-- Recommend the Department of

Education establish a College Preparatory Instruction Project fashioned similar to the initial College-Level Academic Skills Project to determine the knowledge and skills essential for students to have in order to enroll in college credit courses, to establish a single testing instrument to be administered in the high schools to determine whether students have the knowledge and skills, and to relate the knowledge and skills to the skills tested on the College-Level Academic Skills Test.

The 1989 Legislature directed the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission to assess the college and vocational preparatory programs in the community colleges and Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University. The assessment was completed, and a report and recommendations were submitted to the State Board of Education and the 1990 Legislature in April, 1990. The report indicated that insufficient preparatory instruction data are collected, that there should be a comprehensive annual publication of preparatory instruction information, and that the Division of Community Colleges should review the preparatory instruction programs in the community colleges more closely. While not addressing the methods included in recommendations twelve, thirteen, fourteen, and fifteen herein, the report supports the objectives of those four recommendations in recommendations of its own.

The Postsecondary Education Planning Commisssion report constitutes a valuable companion to this section of this report and raises questions about time limits for students to remedy deficiencies and about referring severely deficient students elsewhere, perhaps to adult basic education. Students whose deficiencies are so severe that their skill levels are the eighth grade or below are the students for whom adult basic education programs are designed. Such students should be referred to adult basic education where there are no student fees and where they can learn the basic skills thoroughly without facing the three-term limit that applies to college preparatory instruction.

Recommendation 17.-- Recommend that Rule 6A-10.0315, FAC, be amended to establish scores on the entry-level tests therein below which students shall be judged to have reading, writing, and mathematics skills limited to the eighth grade level or below, and to require that such students be referred to the nearest adult basic education programs and refused admission to college preparatory courses and college credit courses until their skill levels reach secondary level, at which time they may be accepted in college preparatory courses.

One of the concerns going into this summative review of the associate in arts degree program was the issue of whether students who have to take college preparatory instruction go on to graduate with the associate in arts degree. A three-part item was placed on the program review questionnaire to find an answer to that question. See appendix 4, item 1.a., b., c., and summary. Twenty-three of the twenty-eight colleges were able to answer all three parts of the item. Of the first-time-in-college students in the 1985-86 report year who indicated they were seeking the associate in arts degree and were enrolled in college preparatory instruction, 9.7 percent had graduated with the associate in arts degree by the end of the 1987-88 report year, and 32.3 percent had not yet graduated but were still enrolled at the community college. The remaining 58 percent had not graduated and were not still enrolled at the community college.

Data collection by the Division of Community Colleges has involved aggregate data rather than individually identifiable student records. Within a few months, the change to a data collection system involving individually identifiable student records will be complete. Consequently, the research potential of the new data base will be significantly more than before. The concern of the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission with what it believes to be insufficient college preparatory instruction data will be resolved or capable of resolution.

Although the research potential of the new data base will be significant, there are no research positions in the Division of Community Colleges. For the research potential of the new data base to be fully realized, researchers need to be employed.

Recommendation 18.-- Recommend the personnel positions assigned to the Division of Community Colleges and funded be increased to provide research services, especially to capitalize on the research potential of the new student-based data collection system.

General Education

General education in the State Community College System is determined by the individual community colleges with few constraints from outside the institution. State Board of Education rules require at least thirty-six credits in general education courses determined by the institution. Six of the credits must be earned in mathematics at the level of college algebra or higher. Twelve of the credits must be earned in courses in the general humanities requiring a total of at least 24,000 words of writing. The English and mathematics courses required by the institution must include coverage of 116 skills prescribed in Rule 6A-10.0310, FAC.

Table 22 was prepared from information in the community college catalogs to provide a graphic description of the composition of the associate in arts degree programs, especially the general education core of the programs. The range of credits required in each major subject area is displayed along with the mean, median, and mode. All twenty-eight community colleges require English, humanities, mathematics, natural science, and social science courses as part of the general education core. At least six credits are required in each of those areas except in humanities at one community college where three credits are required.

Physical education courses are required by twenty

TABLE 22

Range of General Education Credits Required in Community College A. A. Degree Programs

	Minimum	Mean	Median	Mode	Maximum
English	6	8.75	9	9	12
Humanities	3	6.68	6	6	10
Mathematics	6	6.11	6	6	8
Natural Science	6	7.46	7.5	6	10
Social Science	6	8.46	9	9	12
Physical Ed.	0	2.36	2	4	8
Other	0	2.04	0	0	9
Gen. Ed. Core	36	41.86	42	45	48
Electives	16	21.28	21.5	24	26
A.A. Degree	60	63.14	64	64	68

of the community colleges. Thirteen of the community colleges require other courses outside the above areas as part of the general education core. Only two colleges require no more than the minimum thirty-six credits in the general education core, and one college requires forty-eight credits. Electives range from sixteen credits to twenty-six credits. Credits required for the associate in arts degree range from the minimum sixty credits at four colleges to sixty-eight credits at one college.

Refer to the definition of the associate in arts degree in the introductory chapter of this report, page two. Rule 6A-14.030(1), FAC, says the degree is to be awarded at sixty credits. However, Rule 6A-10.024(4)(a), FAC, says the degree requires at least sixty credits. The community colleges obviously are following the latter rule. The inconsistency in the two rules should be corrected.

Recommendation 19.-- Recommend Rule 6A-14.030(1), FAC, be amended in the fourth sentence to read: Upon satisfactory completion of a planned program of at least sixty (60) college credits, including the demonstration of the attainment of predetermined and specified performance requirements, and subject to law and rule, the associate in arts degree shall be awarded.

General education is a perennially popular topic with the intensity of interest waxing and waning with the sensing of societal change. Currently, nineteen of the community colleges are studying their general education core. Invariably, such studies begin, and logically so, with efforts to agree about what general education is and is supposed to do. Nearly four decades ago, B. Lamar Johnson summarized various attempts at definitions of general education in General Education in Action published by the American Council on Education:

> General education has been described as "that education which leads to an understanding of the major fields of knowledge and the interrelationships between them," . . . as simply "the nonspecialized and nonvocational education which should be the heritage of all," . . . as "education for the common life," as an education "educating a man's humanity rather than indulging his individuality," and as "that form of education which prepares people for their common activities as citizens in a free

> society." Some definitions stress fields of learning and their relationships. Some see it as a core of absolutes to be found in the "Great Books." Some emphasize the common needs and activities of students -- some the needs of society and the demands it places on all citizens. Others recognize both the characteristics of students and of society. Some regard general education as a process of learning, others as a combination of content and process. Some think of it as a means of developing the whole personality and conditioning its behavior. From the diversity of these and other descriptions and definitions emerges, however, a search for unity, for synthesis, a recognition of common needs and opportunities. (p.19)

Table 23 will help the reader begin to judge the way that the community colleges tend to view general education. The table shows the range in the number of courses that students can take to satisfy the general education requirements in each major subject area and provides the mean, median, and mode. Students at the community college that provides the fewest courses from which to satisfy its general education requirements choose from fifty-one courses. Students at the college that provides the most courses from which to satisfy its general education requirements choose from 263 courses. The mean is 113. The number of the course options in this context is not a matter of institutional size and resources, but of approach to general education. The community colleges tend to view general education as a sampling of the liberal arts, including survey courses in the broad fields of knowledge. The state universities have the same view. Several decades ago, the view was

TABLE 23

Range of Courses Offered to Meet General Education Requirements In Community Colleges

	Minimum	Mean	Median	Mode	Maximum
English	2	6.86	5	3	21
Humanities	1	17.86	15	. .	44
Mathematics	5	13.00	11	. .	72
Natural Science	10	25.61	21	. .	54
Social Science	2	16.14	14	. .	38
Physical Ed.	0	21.14	19.5	0	76
Other	0	12.50	0	0	98
Gen. Ed. Core	51	113.11	104	. .	263

different. Especially designed integrated courses or multidisciplinary courses were typical then.

As the community college catalogs were examined to produce tables 22 and 23, they also were examined to learn whether the purposes of the general education core were expressed either in the parts of the catalogs that described the general education core or in other parts. The purposes of the general education core were stated in seventeen of the twenty-eight catalogs. All but three of the seventeen statements were brief and general statements not expressed in terms of expected results that could be evaluated. The three exceptions were sufficiently specific to identify components within the general education core. One of the three approached being stated in terms of expected results that could be determined.

It is axiomatic that the curriculum of a college carry out the purpose of the college. Extended to the general education core of the associate in arts degree program, it follows that the general education curriculum of the college must carry out the purpose of general education within the associate in arts degree program within the overall purpose of the college.

Accreditation criteria of the College Delegate Assembly of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools address institutional purpose. A published statement of purpose is required and must address all components of the institution's purpose. The general education core is a significant component of the associate in arts degree program, and the core is addressed independently in the criteria. Finally, the criteria require the institution to demonstrate that its purpose is being fulfilled. None of this can be expected to happen unless the purpose is stated with sufficient functional specificity to allow application and measurement.

Recommendation 20.-- Recommend that each community college develop a statement of the purpose of the general education core of the associate in arts degree program that contains sufficient detail to identify each component of the general education core and sufficient functional specificity to provide for application and measurement.

Recognition of the need to reexamine general education in light of the continuing criticism of education and in light of the radical changes in domestic and international society has grown in Florida and the nation. Nineteen of the community colleges have indicated their need to reexamine their general education programs. The general education core constitutes as much as 74 percent of some associate in arts degree programs. There are well-entrenched courses and attitudes involved. Changes in the general education core have far-reaching fiscal impacts. The need is widespread and the task is large.

International Education

Alien students accounted for 2 percent (15,626) of the students in associate in arts degree programs the last five years (table 19). The Hispanic population, particularly in south Florida, is significant. Foreign tourists visit Florida attractions in large numbers. Businesses that are active in foreign trade operate from Florida. International banking is active in Florida. Foreign investors are active in Florida. The international drug trade affects every Florida community. Florida is in close proximity to the

Caribbean. Newspapers and news broadcasts deal more with foreign news than with United States news. Events in places such as the U.S.S.R., Germany, the Middle East, South Africa, Central America, South America, China, and Japan are changing the world and are affecting our lives now and for the future. Under such conditions and circumstances, we certainly are neither isolated nor independent, and we cannot afford to be provincial. Under such conditions and circumstances, the general education core of the associate in arts degree program must recognize our interdependence and our increasing interaction with other countries and cultures. The statement of purpose of the general education core in recommendation twenty should be developed recognizing these conditions and circumstances.

Two of the twenty-eight community colleges have completed formal processes of restructuring their associate in arts degree programs to include international education components. One additional community college is in such a process now. Only one college has a separately defined international education requirement in its associate in arts degree program.

Sixteen community colleges conducted associate in arts degree program courses overseas during 1985-88, producing the enrollment reported in table 24. The decrease in enrollment shown in table 24 may reflect the

TABLE 24

Enrollment in
A.A. Degree Program Courses Overseas

	Headcount	FTE
1985-86	1,651	165
1986-87	1,100	118
1987-88	1,282	125

questions at that time about the participation of community college students in overseas study. Since then, the appropriateness of overseas study has been confirmed and encouraged in Section 240.137, Florida Statutes, by the establishment of linkage institutes between the community colleges and universities and selected foreign countries. Five community colleges currently offer overseas instruction in residence and seventeen currently offer overseas instruction in tour.

Recommendation 21.-- Recommend that each community college that has not done so examine the general education core of its associate in arts degree program to determine whether the core includes international awareness/education in proportion to the need in Florida and the world today, and adjust the general education core consistent with the findings.

Instructional Methods

One of the issues agreed upon for the summative review of the associate in arts degree program dealt with methods of instruction. Three items on the program review questionnaire dealt with the issue. See appendix

A, items 5, 6, and 7.

An initial question is what methods of instruction are used. The questionnaire listed twelve methods and asked that the methods used be checked, and that methods used but not listed be entered in space provided. The list is printed below, and the number of community colleges that checked each item is indicated. Two colleges added three methods: correspondence study, demonstrations, field trips. Computer-assisted instruction was not on the list and no community college mentioned it.

28	Lecture
28	Lecture-Discussion
28	Laboratory
27	Learning Laboratory Independent Study
23	Learning Laboratory Group Instruction
21	Broadcast Television
20	Nonlearning Laboratory Independent Study
19	Cooperative Education
18	Closed Circuit Television
17	Overseas Instruction in Tour
13	Internship
5	Overseas Instruction in Residence

A related question is what methods of recognizing prior learning and awarding college credit are used. The questionnaire listed five methods and asked that the methods used be checked, and that methods used but not listed be entered in space provided. The list is printed below, and the number of community colleges that checked each item is indicated. Three colleges added three methods: apprenticeship, industry schools, National Management Association program. Remember that the subject is associate in arts degree credit.

28	Credit by Examination
18	Credit for Military Schooling
12	Evaluation of Experiential Learning
8	Credit for Military Service
2	Credit for Community Service

The questionnaire asked whether the community colleges were engaged in any curriculum or instruction innovations. Seventeen community colleges answered yes and provided descriptions of the innovations. The descriptions are in appendix 9.

Class Size

As institutions where teaching is emphasized and where contact and interaction between students and teachers are emphasized, community colleges monitor class size closely. The legislature has provided additional funding on occasion to reduce class size. For a number of years, the legislature has stated in the General Appropriations Act that class sizes in English and mathematics courses are to be reduced to an average of twenty-two students.

Item fourteen on the program review questionnaire asked the community colleges for the number of students and the number of course sections in each of ten clusters of courses. Twenty-four of the community colleges were able to provide the information. Average class sizes were calculated from the information and are reported in table 25.

The CCICS codes in table 25 are the Community College Information Classification Structure codes for advanced and professional courses, which are the courses in associate in arts degree programs. All advanced and professional courses are accounted for under one or the other of the coded discipline clusters listed in the table. Gordon Rule courses are the mathematics and writing courses required in Rule 6A-10.030, FAC. The average number of students per section is reported in the table for each cluster and for the total according to whether the sections were taught by full-time faculty or part-time faculty. In the advanced and professional courses, about 70 percent of the sections were taught by full-time faculty and about 30 percent by part-time faculty.

Table 25 shows the overall average class size was 21.87 students for sections taught by full-time faculty

TABLE 25

Average Class Sizes in
Advanced and Professional Courses
1987-88

		Students per Section Taught by	
CCICS Code	Discipline Cluster	Full-Time Faculty	Part-Time Faculty
1.11	Natural Science	23.93	21.03
1.12	Fine and Applied Art	11.71	10.58
1.13	Letters and Foreign Language	20.86	20.34
1.14	Education	20.12	20.32
1.15	Business and Management	18.87	18.68
1.16	Math & Computer Science	24.47	22.88
1.17	Social Science	26.58	23.31
1.18	Other	22.57	20.72
	Total	21.87	19.81
	Gordon Rule Writing Courses*	26.49	22.81
	Gordon Rule Math Courses*	25.63	23.35

*These are included in the coded clusters. Here, they are separated to report the information for Gordon Rule courses alone.

and 19.81 students for sections taught by part-time faculty. Full-time faculty averaged larger class sizes than part-time faculty in every cluster but education, with the size differences ranging from less than one student to nearly four students. The social science discipline cluster had the largest average class size at 26.58 students for sections taught by full-time faculty. But, right next to the social science average class size were the averages for the courses for which the legislature wanted the sizes reduced to twenty-two, the Gordon Rule courses. Gordon Rule writing courses averaged 26.49 students and Gordon Rule math courses averaged 25.63 students per section for sections taught by full-time faculty.

With an average class size of 26.49 students in Gordon Rule writing courses, it could be postulated that a freshman English instructor assigned five sections, a full load, would have about 133 students. The Gordon Rule calls for six thousand words of writing in that course for each of those 133 students. At that rate, the freshman English instructor would have to correct, comment on, and grade eighty-five pages of student longhand every day in addition to other responsibilities. If the average class size were reduced to twenty-two, as urged in the General Appropriations Act, the number of pages per day would be seventy.

The community colleges have developed alternative strategies to accomplish the objective of the Gordon Rule to provide students with adequate writing instruction and practice. The teaching loads of instructors ordinarily are assigned so that not all the sections taught are writing sections. Further distribution of writing instruction responsibility sometimes is accomplished by the methodology of writing across the curriculum, which involves faculty outside the English departments. Variations of writing laboratories frequently are provided. Graders sometimes are used. These and other positive alternative strategies are used by the community colleges to provide extensive writing instruction and practice.

The class size issue is closely related to funding, and is referred to again later in this report in the section on costs.

Faculty

Full-Time/Part-Time Faculty

Part-time faculty are important to community colleges. They bring to the classroom experiences and points of view from outside the academic community. They make it possible for community colleges to offer courses that the full-time faculty are not prepared to teach. They make it possible for community colleges to add a few additional course sections that constitute less than a full-time teaching load. They make it possible to accommodate unanticipated enrollment increases. They make it possible for community colleges to maintain staffing margins that enable them to respond immediately to reduced needs for course sections with minimal personnel displacement trauma.

There may be another reason, a different kind of reason why part-time faculty are important to community colleges. They are paid at a significantly lower rate than full-time faculty. Of course full-time faculty are assigned additional responsibilities. Whether that financial influence or other factors result in staffing patterns that may rely too heavily on part-time faculty is a growing concern. Some of the community college personnel who attended the program review hearings said their colleges try for a seven to three ratio of full-time to part-time faculty. That ratio was mentioned more than any other.

No research has been found to suggest that one ratio of full-time to part-time faculty is better than another. In fact, some colleges in the United States rely entirely on part-time faculty. An appropriate ratio probably is situational. Two of many situational elements are institutional mission and student characteristics. The missions of the Florida community colleges and the characteristics of the students were discussed earlier in this report and probably are incompatible with faculties where 100 percent are part-time. What the appropriate percentage might be depends on additional situational elements, and probably would vary among the colleges. As stated earlier, the most frequent judgement expressed during the program review was 30 percent part-time.

One way of viewing the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty is based on the number of personnel. Another way is based on the number of course sections taught, the number of students taught, or the number of credits generated. The second way accounts for impact and has more meaning.

Table 26 reports the number and percentage of the full-time and part-time teaching faculty on October 1 of 1987, 1988, and 1989. The information is available for all faculty only. Faculty who teach advanced and professional courses, the courses in the associate in arts degree programs, are not reported separately in the Community College Management Information System.

TABLE 26

Number of Teaching Faculty
Part-Time/Full-Time
State Community College System

	Full-Time		Part-Time	
	#	%	#	%
October 1, 1987	4,230	28.82	10,448	71.18
October 1, 1988	4,293	29.74	10,141	70.26
October 1, 1989	4,536	28.29	11,499	71.71

Item fourteen on the program review questionnaire asked the community colleges for the number of course sections, the duplicated headcount in the sections, and the number of credits produced in each of ten clusters of courses, according to whether taught by full-time faculty or by part-time faculty. Twenty-four of the community colleges were able to provide the information. The percentages taught were calculated from the information and are reported in table 27.

The CCICS codes in table 27 are the Community College Information Classification Structure codes for advanced and professional courses, which are the courses in associate in arts degree programs. All advanced and professional courses are accounted for under one or the other of the coded discipline clusters listed in the table. Gordon Rule courses are the mathematics and writing courses required in Rule 6A-10.030, FAC.

Rounding off the percentages, table 27 shows that full-time faculty teach 70 percent of the total sections, teach 72 percent of the total students, and produce 74 percent of the total credits. The percentages of part-time faculty teaching in the coded discipline clusters of natural science, social science, and other are less than the overall percentages of part-time faculty for all three measures: sections, students, and credits. Part-time faculty are relied upon most in

TABLE 27

Percentages of Sections, Students, Credits Taught by Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty Advanced and Professional Courses 1987-88

CCICS Code	Discipline Cluster	Sections		Students		Credits	
		FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT
1.11	Natural Science	77.83	22.17	79.98	20.02	81.93	18.07
1.12	Fine and Applied Art	64.56	35.44	66.85	33.15	70.22	29.78
1.13	Letters and Foreign Language	68.62	31.38	69.17	30.83	68.81	31.19
1.14	Education	65.43	34.57	65.21	34.79	67.94	32.06
1.15	Business and Management	63.41	36.59	63.65	36.35	63.50	36.50
1.16	Mathematics and Computer Science	69.19	30.81	70.60	29.40	72.04	27.96
1.17	Social Science	73.52	26.48	76.00	24.00	76.29	23.71
1.18	Other	74.90	25.10	76.47	23.53	80.41	19.59
	Total	70.25	29.75	72.28	27.72	73.54	26.46
	Gordon Rule Writing Courses*	72.74	27.26	75.60	24.40	74.66	25.34
	Gordon Rule Mathematics Courses*	70.09	29.91	72.01	27.99	73.28	26.72

*These are included in the coded clusters. Here, they are separated to report the information for Gordon Rule courses alone.

business and management courses followed by education and fine and applied art. In the Gordon Rule courses, the full-time and part-time faculty percentages are close to the overall percentages, with a little less reliance on part-time faculty in the writing courses.

As stated earlier, the most frequently expressed judgment of appropriate part-time faculty involvement was 30 percent. For all the advanced and professional courses systemwide, the percentage of part-time faculty involvement is 30 percent in the number of sections taught, and is quite close to 30 percent in the number of students taught and the number of credits produced. That is not true, however, college by college. The information from the community colleges used to prepare table 27 reflects large differences among the colleges. One community college reported that 3 percent of its advanced and professional course sections were taught by part-time faculty, and one college reported 46 percent were taught by part-time faculty. Between those extremes, the percentages fell across the full range, with a mean of 28.75 percent and a median of 30.50 percent.

Variations among the community colleges in the degree of reliance on part-time faculty were anticipated. Availability of qualified personnel, stability of enrollment, availability of funds, administrative judgment, and other situational elements affect the degree of reliance on part-time faculty.

To summarize tables 26 and 27, table 26 shows that about 70 percent of all faculty are part-time, but table 27 shows that about 30 percent of advanced and professional instruction is by part-time faculty. The point is that the issue under consideration deals with the involvement of part-time faculty in instruction. Therefore, that involvement has to be measured. It should be measured in relation to the amount of instruction rather than to the number of instructors. Comparing tables 26 and 27 is a graphic demonstration of that point by showing how misleading it can be to look no further than the numbers of instructors.

At several of the program review hearings, the participants were asked whether their community colleges limit the number of course sections per term the part-time faculty are allowed to teach. Some community colleges have no limits. The most restrictive limit heard was two course sections. A common response was twelve credits. While unusual, some part-time faculty have been employed to teach the same load as full-time faculty.

This section of the report has responded to the full-time/part-time faculty issue listed in the chapter on purpose. It has not answered the underlying concern of how much reliance on part-time faculty is appropriate, but it has given definition to the concern. The issue is closely related to funding, and is referred to again later in this report in the section on costs.

Employment Criteria

Faculty selection, evaluation, development, and retention decisions are prerogatives of the individual boards of trustees. Rule 6A-14.060(3), FAC, requires selection, evaluation, development, and retention decisions to be based on the job assignments of the faculty. For example, a mathematics instructor would be selected based on selection criteria judged by the community college to identify successful mathematics instructors. Subsequently, the evaluation, development, and retention criteria would have the same basis.

The program review questionnaire asked the community colleges to identify the criteria they have adopted and use for associate in arts degree program faculty selection, evaluation, development, retention, and dismissal. Twenty-two community colleges were able to provide the information for one or more of the parts of the request.

Based on the information provided, the community colleges tend to rely on the accreditation criteria of the Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, for faculty selection criteria. The community colleges tend to require a masters degree from a regionally accredited institution with eighteen graduate credits in the teaching field. Several of the colleges identified additional criteria related to teaching and associated responsibilities normally expected of faculty. The more carefully defined a position, the better the basis for good personnel selection, for performance evaluation, for developmental needs identification, and for promotion/dismissal determination and defense.

Many of the community colleges identified their evaluation criteria by providing copies of evaluation instruments. In several instances, the evaluation criteria were specific enough to allow the diagnosis of developmental needs. In other words, faculty evaluation and development were related. The types of evaluation included evaluation by students, evaluation by supervisors, and self-evaluation. Among the measures were classroom preparation and performance, nonclassroom activity, self-development activity, and achievement of agreed upon objectives.

Some of the community colleges connected faculty development and retention by requiring specified amounts of developmental activity over prescribed periods. A common method was graduate courses, but many other options were recognized; including workshops, community service, curriculum development, research, and work in a business applying what is taught in the classroom. Several community colleges require annual, written self-development plans from their faculty.

The community colleges that were able to respond to the dismissal part of the request provided information that tended to underscore the opportunity and procedure to appeal dismissal decisions. In some instances, the grounds for dismissal were listed, and in several cases even defined.

The information request was for the criteria used to make faculty selection, evaluation, development, retention, and dismissal decisions. The information received that went into any detail suggests that attention has been and is being given to the procedural steps that are so important in these decisions, and in several instances, suggests equal attention to the criteria upon which the decisions are based. In a few instances, it is apparent that selection, evaluation, development, retention, and dismissal are conceived and treated as interrelated.

Recommendation 22.-- Recommend that the community colleges review their selection criteria for full-time and part-time faculty who teach advanced and professional courses to assure that the selection criteria include criteria that specifically address separate teaching positions and the tasks to be performed in those positions.

Faculty Development

Faculty orientation is about the first faculty development activity of the year that the community colleges provide for faculty. Every community college provides orientation for new faculty, both full-time and part-time. Twenty-five of the colleges provide orientation for returning full-time faculty, and twenty-six colleges provide orientation for returning part-time faculty. The orientation programs frequently go beyond orientation to the institution to include other faculty development activities. Orientation programs include large group meetings, departmental meetings, and two-person meetings. They involve presidents, vice presidents, deans, chairs, and faculty. Instructional support personnel participate. Sometimes, mentor systems are used.

Rule 6A-10.029, FAC, although not effective for the 1990-91 fiscal year, requires each community college to reserve 2 percent of its apportionment from the Community College Program Fund for staff and program development activities. Records of expenditures were kept centrally for a number of years, and the expenditures consistently exceeded the 2 percent. The staff and program development funding plan is well established in Florida and has widespread support.

The staff and program development rule was amended several years ago to require the community colleges to use 25 percent of their staff and program development funds, or the equivalent from other funds, for equal access and equal opportunity activities directed toward minorities. If staff and program development funds are so used, the definitions and restrictions in the rule apply.

The staff and program development rule does not specify the percentage of the fund to be used for staff development and the percentage to be used for program development. It does not specify the percentage of the amount used for staff development that is to be reserved for faculty development as opposed to administrator development or support staff development. Whether such specificity should be placed in the rule was asked at one of the hearings. The staff and program development needs among the community colleges are not the same. Therefore, placing such specificity in the rule would restrict the ability of a community college to provide for its staff and program development needs in proportion to the extent of the needs at that college.

Another question during the hearings was whether there should be a funded program at the state level to help provide for faculty development. Such a program probably would be workable, and probably would help with faculty development needs that a central office might appropriately coordinate and fund. An example of an element is the faculty exchange program of the Florida

Association of Community Colleges. However, an issue of this magnitude would require time and exploration before the overall feasibility could be determined.

A continuing developmental challenge for faculty is their responsibility to keep up to date in their disciplines. Staff and program development funds enable the community colleges to help the faculty with that responsibility. Item seventeen on the program review questionnaire asked the community colleges to identify the disciplines in which their faculty have difficulty remaining current. Sixteen of the colleges, two more than half, indicated none. One college said education and one college said all disciplines. The other responses were science or technology related. See appendix 4, item 17. These findings are consistent with the rapid developments in science and technology, but the majority of colleges indicated the faculty are able to keep up with the developments. That achievement probably is due in large part to the colleges assuming responsibility for helping faculty remain current by providing the time, the money, and the coordination for a wide variety of faculty development activities.

The following is a list of the more common faculty development activities provided for associate in arts degree program faculty and/or paid for by the community colleges. Things not listed but provided by some community colleges include teleconferences, visual and performing arts presentations and tickets, sabbatical leaves, and professional journals. The list indicates the number of colleges that provide and/or pay for each activity and whether the beneficiaries are full-time or part-time faculty.

F-T Faculty	Activity	P-T Faculty
28	Professional Meetings	10
28	College Visits	7
27	Courses	10
27	SUS Faculty Visits	10
27	Workshops	19
26	Guest Speakers	19
24	Consultants	18

To help faculty carry out their responsibilities, the community colleges provide a variety of support services. The following is a list of the more common faculty support services provided by the community colleges. Support services not listed but provided by some colleges include library research, testing centers, and test item banks. The list indicates the number of colleges that provide each support service and whether the beneficiaries are full-time or part-time faculty.

F-T Faculty	Service	P-T Faculty
28	Duplicating	28
28	Office Space	14

27	Audiovisual Production	27
27	Lab Assistants	25
27	Typing	24
25	Personal Computer	13
13	Examination Grading	12

Developing a successful faculty requires attention to attrition, enrollment growth, and composition. Seventeen of the community colleges opened in the 1960s. Seven more community colleges opened within four years of the 1960s. That accounts for twenty-three of the twenty-eight colleges, and means that the early faculty of those colleges, who have stayed with the State Community College System, have been with the System for perhaps thirty years. The college presidents raise the caution that a significant increase in the faculty retirement rate is near.

Florida is one of the very fastest growing states, and that growth is reflected in the community colleges. From table 16, we find that full-time equivalent student enrollment in advanced and professional courses, which make up the associate in arts degree program, has increased 39 percent in the last four years. The need for additional faculty is pronounced.

Faculty attrition and enrollment growth provide opportunities for improving the composition of the faculty to attain variety in age, in experience, in graduate schools represented, in gender, and especially in ethnic groups represented. However, qualified faculty applicants are not abundant, particularly in some disciplines such as mathematics and the sciences, and especially among the minority ethnic groups.

These conditions affecting attrition, enrollment growth, and composition present challenges and problems for the legislature, the Division of Community Colleges, and the individual community colleges. To be dealt with, they must be defined and understood. Definition demands data and understanding requires study. These findings provide additional support for recommendation seventeen and prompt the following recommendation.

Recommendation 23.-- Recommend that the changes currently being made in the data collection system of the Division of Community Colleges assure the collection of adequate data to enable defining, tracking, and projecting enrollment trends, faculty attrition, faculty composition, and other faculty characteristics by discipline in order to support extensive studies of those critical issues to provide state level and institutional decision makers with the information necessary to take informed action.

Learning Resources

The 1987 Legislature appropriated $406,999 for ten community colleges to convert the bibliographic information in their libraries into machine-readable form. The 1988 Legislature appropriated $310,750 for thirteen community colleges to convert the bibliographic information in their libraries into machine-readable form. The 1988 Legislature also appropriated $23,400 for the development of a plan for library automation for the State Community College System. The 1989 and 1990 Legislatures each appropriated $3,000,000 to carry out the plan for library automation. The State Community College System has established the Community College Library Automation Center (CCLA), an ambitious, comprehensive library automation system that will improve services, create network information systems, and streamline operations significantly. The CCLA will be operating fully by 1991, making it one of the most advanced systems in the country.

Table 28 shows which library services are available at community college campuses, centers, and other instructional sites, as reported on the program review questionnaire. The table indicates that one community college library does not provide research assistance, one community college library does not provide equipment for using nonprint materials, and two community college libraries do not provide for interlibrary loans. The criteria for accreditation by the Commission on colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools require the college libraries to offer personal assistance in conducting library research, to have equipment for using print and nonprint materials, and to have provision for interlibrary loan agreements.

TABLE 28

Library Services Available

	Campuses	Centers	Other Sites
Orientation	28	13	3
Print Material	28	14	4
Nonprint Material	28	16	4
Reference Material	28	14	3
Bibliography/Catalog	28	12	4
Research Assistance	27	11	2
Nonprint Materials Equip.	27	15	5
Interlibrary Loan	26	14	5

Twenty-four of the twenty-eight community colleges have centers.

Twenty-four of the community colleges operate instructional centers away from the campuses. Table 28 shows that the number of community colleges that provide the services listed in the table at their instructional centers ranges from eleven to sixteen. The criteria for accreditation by the Commission on Colleges call for the colleges to "ensure the provision of and access to adequate learning resources and services required to support the courses, programs and degrees offered" at off-campus locations. Theoretically, the learning resources and services necessary for a course on campus would be the same for the same course off campus.

Recommendation 24.-- Recommend the community colleges evaluate their library services on campus and at off-campus sites to ensure that basic library services are provided as required in the criteria for accreditation by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

According to the responses to the program review questionnaire, not all community colleges measure the effectiveness of their library services. Those that do tend to use surveys of students, faculty, and staff. In addition to surveys of those who use the services, the community colleges apply experience and professional judgment to the study of library utilization data. Study teams sometimes are used, perhaps the college learning resources committee or a special task force. Twenty-one of the colleges measure the effectiveness of their library services on their campuses. Nine measure the effectiveness of their library services at instructional centers away from the campuses, and three measure the effectiveness of their library services at other instructional sites.

For many years, legislative appropriations for the operation of community colleges have included special funding to improve library holdings beyond what would have been possible with only the regular operating funds from the Community College Program Fund. Until 1986-87, the special funding to improve library holdings was included in special funding for instructional equipment or particular categories of instruction. Beginning in 1986-87, the special funding to overcome deficiencies in library holdings was designated separately.

Table 29 reports the special funds provided by the legislature since 1984 for the community colleges to add to the funds they regularly provide to purchase library materials. The special funds were for library materials and instructional equipment in 1984-85, and were for library materials and preparatory instruction in 1985-86. Thereafter, the special funds were for library materials only. Greater detail is provided in appendix 10.

TABLE 29

Supplemental Appropriations for Library
Print and Nonprint Materials
1984-91

1984-85	$ 900,000*
1985-86	3,000,000**
1986-87	1,000,000
1987-88	2,032,131
1988-89	4,535,240
1989-90	6,000,000
1990-91	6,000,000

*For library materials and instructional equipment.
**For library materials and preparatory instruction.

Learning resources is classified in the Community College Information Classification Structure as a subfunction under the academic support function. The learning resources subfunction includes libraries, audiovisual services, museums and galleries, planetariums, and auditoriums. The Community College Management Information System does not separate expenditures below the subfunction level, and the attempt to obtain the information from the community colleges on the program review questionnaire was not successful.

Table 30 shows the direct costs of all learning resources and the rates of change from 1984-85 through 1988-89. Direct costs are personnel costs, supplies and services, and equipment depreciation, and do not include print and nonprint materials. The decrease of 1.13 percent in learning resources direct costs in 1985-86 occurred at the same time as the enrollment decreases shown in tables 16 and 17. The following year, 1986-87, learning resources direct cost expenditures increased by nearly 5 percent, and each of the next two years, 1987-89, by nearly 10 percent. For comparison, the total revenue from the state for the community colleges, except for capital outlay, for the same years in table 30 increased 5.89 percent, 10.25 percent, 12.63 percent, and 13.37 percent.

Later in this report in the section on costs, the

TABLE 30

Learning Resources, Direct Costs
1984-89

	Amount	% Increase or Decrease
1984-85	$25,630,589	. . .
1985-86	25,341,824	-1.13%
1986-87	26,570,781	+4.85%
1987-88	29,187,355	+9.85%
1988-89	32,077,874	+9.90%

problem of actual full-time equivalent student enrollment far exceeding the full-time equivalent student enrollment that is state funded is described. That problem makes it hard to allow increases in learning resources direct cost expenditures to keep pace with increases in revenue from the state for the community colleges.

Advisement

The 1989 Legislature felt the need to provide special funding to "enhance the quality and amount of academic and career advisement." For that purpose and for the purposes of "improving instruction" and of providing "for an award system to recognize excellence in instruction and advising," the 1989 Legislature provided $3,000,000 for the community colleges, with the provision that each board of trustees distribute its portion of the $3,000,000 on a competitive grant basis within its community college.

The community colleges reported to the legislature how they were using the special funding. Regarding advisement, the community colleges reported that they were developing computer assisted advising systems, producing advisement literature, developing early alert systems to identify students with problems, developing student progress tracking systems, paying for more advising/counseling personnel time, implementing placement testing by computer, providing more information and training for advisers, establishing career information centers, designing career development courses, and developing intervention strategies for working with students with problems.

All the community colleges provide academic advising on their campuses. Of the twenty-four community colleges that operate centers away from the campuses, twenty provide academic advising at the centers. Ten colleges provide academic advising at other instructional sites.

The program review questionnaire asked the community colleges to rate the adequacy of their associate in arts degree program academic advising. Table 31 provides a tally of the responses. Although

TABLE 31

Quality of Academic Advising in
A. A. Degree Programs, Self-Ratings

	Campuses	Centers	Other Instructional Sites
Very Good	11	7	6
Good	14	9	2
Satisfactory	3	4	4
Poor	. .	1	1
Very Poor	. .	. .	. .

only ten colleges said that they provide academic advising at instructional sites other than campuses and centers, thirteen colleges rated their academic advising at other instructional sites.

The reader must remember that the ratings in table 31 are self-ratings, and may not have resulted from structured evaluations. One of the results of effective academic advising is to minimize to the extent possible the number of courses the students will have to take after transferring into the State University System, thereby saving time and money. As stated earlier in this report in the discussion of table 3, there was slightly over a one course difference in the average number of credits earned for the baccalaureate by the community college associate in arts degree graduates and the native students in the State University System each of the last three years. A difference that small is consistent with effective academic advising in the community colleges. However, larger differences are found in a few of the individual baccalaureate programs. Examples are the discipline groupings of law, life sciences, and philosophy, where the differences equate to about four courses.

When the community colleges responded to the program review questionnaire, they told what they believe produces effective academic advising. Some of the community colleges said their academic advising is effective because they use faculty as advisers. Other colleges said their academic advising is effective because they do not use faculty as advisers. As with the issue of the appropriate degree of reliance on part-time faculty, what works is situational.

A number of characteristics of effective academic advising were identified. Awareness of the importance of academic advising as evidenced by providing time, tools, and reward might be the key to effectiveness. The responses emphasized regular training for advisers and the availability of advisers to students. Frequently mentioned was information, as from advisement manuals, information brochures, and interaction with the State University System. A structured system is necessary, beginning with the orientation of new students before their first registration. The structured system needs to include tracking the progress of the students, with advisers having ready access to that information and regular contact with the students. Computers can facilitate that process.

A very significant component of a comprehensive advisement system is provided by the state. It is a computerized information system about course and admission requirements at the community colleges and state universities. Known as SOLAR, Student On-Line Advisement and Articulation System, the system is available at all community colleges and state universities and at many high schools. SOLAR helps students select the courses to take for their associate in arts degrees based on the state university programs to which they plan to transfer. In addition to information about course prerequisites for university programs, SOLAR also informs students of grade-point-average requirements, examination requirements, required documentation, and any other requirements for admission to the programs. SOLAR is such a strong advisement tool because it provides the information that students need, is readily available, can be easily accessible, and is regularly updated.

For community colleges to make SOLAR easily accessible to students and counselors, they must provide sufficient computer terminals connected to the Florida

Information Resources Network (FIRN) and programmed for SOLAR. The current efforts of the colleges to provide such terminals are encouraged.

Recommendation 25.-- Recommend the community colleges continue their efforts to provide sufficient computer terminals connected to the Florida Information Resources Network (FIRN) and programmed for the Student On-Line Advisement and Articulation System (SOLAR) to give their students and counselors easy access to SOLAR.

Equipment

The community college funding formula includes a factor for equipment replacement. The legislature has recognized that provision is insufficient and has appropriated $23,019,025 in special funding for instructional equipment since 1986-87.

In September, 1988, the community colleges were surveyed by the Division of Community Colleges to identify the basic needs of the community colleges for new and replacement, scientific and technical, instructional equipment. The amount identified was $54,492,215. A five-year plan to provide that amount through special funding started in 1989-90 when the legislature provided $9,407,647. The amount in the 1990-91 legislative budget request was $15,694,492, but only $5,316,689 was appropriated. The amount in the 1991-92 legislative budget request is $11,659,472.

Costs

Selected cost analysis data for 1984-89 have been placed in appendix 11 for readers who want to study costs. Table 32 summarizes the data and displays five years of costs per full-time equivalent student in advanced and professional courses, which are the courses in the associate in arts degree programs, and for all support services, which covers all costs other than instructional. The table also displays the costs per full-time equivalent student for learning resources, which is a subfunction under the academic support function and is included in the total support costs.

Comparing 1988-89 with 1984-85 reveals the following increases. Advanced and professional instructional personnel costs per full-time equivalent student increased 11.2 percent. Total advanced and professional instructional costs per full-time equivalent student increased 14.5 percent. Advanced and professional instructional personnel costs per full-time equivalent student decreased from 81 percent of the total advanced and professional instructional costs in 1985-86 to 78 percent in 1988-89. The pattern in these changes is consistent with the increasing reliance on low-cost, part-time faculty discussed in the faculty section of this report.

The open admissions policy of the community colleges has been mentioned several times in this report. In general, all students with high school

TABLE 32

Costs Per FTE Student
A & P; Total Support; and Academic Support, Learning Resources
1984-89

	1984-85		1985-86			1986-87			1987-88			1988-89			1984-89
	Cost/ FTE	%	Cost/ FTE	%	% Chng	Cost/ FTE	%	% Chng	Cost/ FTE	%	% Chng	Cost/ FTE	%	% Chng	% Chng
Advanced & Professional															
Personnel															
Instructional	1317.82	80	1360.83	81	+ 3.3	1392.97	80	+ 2.4	1434.54	80	+ 3.0	1465.66	78	+ 2.2	+ 11.2
Administrative	86.20	5	90.28	5	+ 4.7	97.52	6	+ 8.0	112.03	6	+14.9	114.17	6	+ 1.9	+ 32.4
Support	119.15	7	123.21	7	+ 3.4	126.37	7	+ 2.6	127.38	7	+ 0.8	144.76	8	+13.6	+ 21.5
Total Pers. Costs	1523.17	93	1574.32	93	+ 3.4	1616.86	93	+ 2.7	1673.95	93	+ 3.5	1724.59	92	+ 3.0	+ 13.2
Supplies and Services	88.00	5	88.64	5	+ 0.7	98.29	6	+10.9	95.96	5	- 2.4	122.88	7	+28.1	+ 39.6
Equipment Depreciation	28.33	2	23.57	1	- 16.8	25.50	1	+ 8.2	25.49	1	- 0.0	29.51	2	+15.8	+ 4.2
Total A & P	1639.50	100	1686.53	100	+ 2.9	1740.65	100	+ 3.2	1795.40	100	+ 3.1	1876.98	100	+ 4.5	+ 14.5
Equipment Expenditures	33.28	. .	30.37	. .	- 8.7	43.52	. .	+43.3	41.85	. .	- 3.8	76.14	. .	+81.9	+128.8
Federal Funds	7.81	. .	18.12	. .	+132.0	17.92	. .	- 1.1	15.07	. .	-15.9	28.47	. .	+88.9	+264.5
Total Support															
Personnel															
Administrative	210.40	12	214.93	12	+ 2.2	217.12	11	+ 1.0	236.20	11	+ 8.8	234.04	11	- 0.9	+ 11.2
Other Professional	288.27	16	309.09	17	+ 7.2	341.68	18	+10.5	378.99	18	+10.9	399.56	19	+ 5.4	+ 38.6
Support	712.39	40	745.40	40	+ 4.6	775.52	40	+ 4.0	806.08	39	+ 3.9	813.69	39	+ 0.9	+ 14.2
Total Pers. Costs	1211.06	67	1269.42	68	+ 4.8	1334.32	69	+ 5.1	1421.27	69	+ 6.5	1447.29	70	+ 1.8	+ 19.5
Supplies and Services	504.86	28	537.10	29	+ 6.4	534.23	28	- 0.5	570.78	28	+ 6.8	551.83	27	- 3.3	+ 9.3
Equipment Depreciation	80.60	4	62.14	3	- 22.9	67.33	3	+ 8.4	70.39	3	+ 4.5	73.22	4	+ 4.0	- 9.2
Total Support	1796.52	100	1868.66	100	+ 4.0	1935.88	100	+ 3.6	2062.43	100	+ 6.5	2072.34	100	+ 0.5	+ 15.4
Equipment Expenditures	90.61	. .	79.27	. .	- 12.5	94.51	. .	+19.2	90.40	. .	- 4.3	105.78	. .	+17.0	+ 16.7
Federal Funds	94.59	. .	98.39	. .	+ 4.0	108.63	. .	+10.4	99.91	. .	- 8.0	97.64	. .	- 2.3	+ 3.2
TOTAL A & P & Support	3436.02	. .	3555.19	. .	+ 3.5	3676.53	. .	+ 3.4	3857.83	. .	+ 4.9	3949.32	. .	+ 2.4	+ 14.9
Academic Support, Learning Resources															
Personnel															
Administrative	12.71	7	13.97	8	+ 9.9	13.21	7	- 5.4	14.30	7	+ 8.3	14.88	8	+ 4.1	+ 17.1
Other Professional	46.74	25	48.07	26	+ 2.8	52.35	29	+ 8.9	57.17	30	+ 9.2	59.34	30	+ 3.8	+ 27.0
Support	73.24	39	72.76	40	- 0.7	71.91	39	- 1.2	75.20	39	+ 4.6	76.21	39	+ 1.3	+ 4.1
Total Pers. Costs	132.69	71	134.80	74	+ 1.6	137.47	75	+ 7.7	146.67	76	+ 6.7	150.43	77	+ 2.6	+ 13.4
Supplies and Services	25.24	13	24.96	14	- 1.1	21.43	12	-14.1	21.95	11	+ 2.4	21.84	11	- 0.5	- 13.5
Equipment Depreciation	29.00	16	21.89	12	- 24.5	24.14	13	+10.3	23.66	12	- 1.7	22.87	12	- 3.3	- 21.1
Total A. S., L. R.	186.93	100	181.65	100	- 2.8	183.04	100	+ 0.8	192.28	100	+ 5.0	195.14	100	+ 1.5	+ [illegible]

diplomas or the equivalent are eligible for admission to all but reading, writing, and mathematics advanced and professional courses, and such students without remedial reading, writing, and mathematics needs are eligible for admission to the reading, writing, and mathematics advanced and professional courses. Students with remedial reading, writing, and mathematics needs are eligible for admission to college preparatory instruction to correct their remedial needs.

The open admissions policy of the community colleges is official policy of the legislature, the State Board of Education, and the State Board of Community Colleges. A growing concern is the potential impact on the open admissions policy of basing legislative budget requests and appropriations for the Community College Program Fund for the operation of the community colleges on significantly less full-time equivalent student enrollment than actually occurs. This circumstance is caused by establishing the enrollment on which legislative appropriations are made on a three-year rolling average, using the actual enrollment for the two most recent years and the estimated enrollment for the current year. During periods of consistent and significant enrollment growth over a number of years, the three-year average lags far enough behind the actual enrollment to result in significant and sustained amounts of unfunded enrollment. The consequence is that the colleges must either violate the open admissions policy by refusing eligible students, or they must apply cost cutting measures.

Efficient administration of public funds is very important, but cost cutting measures should not keep the colleges from their legal mission or reduce quality below an acceptable level. Two cost cutting measures with great impact are to increase class size and to increase the reliance on low-cost, part-time faculty. Both measures were discussed earlier in this report, and data were provided in tables 25, 26, and 27. Class size in Gordon Rule English and mathematics courses has been a matter of concern, including legislative concern, for a number of years. The increasing reliance on low-cost, part-time faculty has become a matter of concern.

Table 33 compares the full-time equivalent student enrollment upon which the legislature based the advanced and professional instruction portion of its appropriations for the Community College Program Fund for the last four years with the actual full-time equivalent student enrollment. Each of the four years, the actual FTE enrollment exceeded the FTE enrollment used by the legislature. The difference increased each year. For 1989-90, the difference was 16,369 FTE, which means that 17.9 percent of the advanced and professional FTE was

TABLE 33

FTE Student Enrollment
State Funded/Actual
Advanced and Professional Courses
1986-90

	State Funded FTE	Actual FTE	Difference	
			Number	Percent
1986-87	68,734	70,244	+ 1,510	+ 2.15%
1987-88	68,638	76,666	+ 8,028	+10.47%
1988-89	70,116	83,060	+12,944	+15.58%
1989-90	75,093	91,462	+16,369	+17.90%

not state funded. That is nearly one-fifth of the advanced and professional instruction full-time equivalent student enrollment.

To learn what this practice means when extended to all the classifications of instruction except lifelong learning and community instructional services, table 34 was prepared. The table compares the full-time equivalent student enrollment funded by the state the last four years with the actual full-time equivalent student enrollment. The classifications of instruction covered in the table are advanced and professional, all vocational, and all adult general education except lifelong learning.

Table 34 shows that each of the last four years, actual FTE enrollment exceeded the FTE enrollment funded

TABLE 34

Unfunded FTE Student Enrollment
A & P, Vocational, Adult General*
1986-90

	State Funded FTE	Actual FTE	Not State Funded		
			FTE	%	$
1986-87	134,042	138,142	+ 4,100	+ 2.97%	$11,772,494
1987-88	134,526	144,866	+10,340	+ 7.14%	$32,425,103
1988-89	138,158	156,841	+18,683	+11.91%	$63,681,939
1989-90	145,646	170,478	+24,832	+14.57%	$89,453,555

*Except lifelong learning

by the state. In 1986-87, the FTE enrollment that was not state funded was 4,100 or 2.97 percent of the actual enrollment. In 1989-90, the unfunded FTE enrollment was 24,832 or 14.57 percent of the actual enrollment. The fiscal impact in 1989-90 was $89,453,555. Over the four years in the table, the fiscal impact was $197,333,091.

It is hard to imagine how the cost cutting measures necessitated by four years of negative fiscal impact of this magnitude can avoid reducing quality. It is hard to imagine how this funding practice can continue without forcing the restriction of student admissions.

Recommendation 26.-- Recommend that the full-time equivalent student enrollment factored into the legislative budget request and appropriation for the Community College Program Fund be based on the actual enrollment for the year immediately preceding the budget year.

The questionnaire used in the summative review of the associate in arts degree program caused the expenditure of community college personnel time and computer time. The advisory committee for the review, composed primarily of community college personnel, felt that the questionnaire was appropriate. Still, the questionnaire is an example of the increasing collection of information from the community colleges, which has a pronounced fiscal impact and causes a great deal of concern.

Demands for reports come from federal, state, and other units of government, and have increased to the point of being onerous according to the judgment of some. The fiscal impact of the recording, processing, and reporting of data and the other forms of information that constitute reporting overall must be recognized by those who demand the information. Careful stewardship of public funds requires everyone to discipline themselves to limit their demands for information to what is essential to carry out the mission of the community colleges consistent with the locus of responsibility.

Personnel costs account for 79 percent of the costs of operating the community colleges, and are watched carefully by the community colleges. College personnel are reported according to categories. One category is other professional personnel, which includes includes professionals other than instructional personnel and administrators. Examples include accountants, counselors, and researchers. It is in that category that data processing professionals are placed, and it is in that category that the rate of growth is by far the largest for any personnel category.

Table 35 compares the increases in the numbers of full-time instructional personnel, executive/administrative/managerial personnel, and other professional personnel during the ten years from the fall of 1978 through the fall of 1988. The number of full-time instructional personnel increased only 9.2 percent and the executive/administrative/managerial personnel actually decreased 22.4 percent. But, the other professional personnel increased 123 percent. The reliance on low-cost, part-time faculty and larger than preferred class sizes to compensate for the failure to fund actual enrollment as discussed earlier, also helps to make possible the support services provided by the large increase in other professional personnel.

The growth in the other professional personnel category is not limited to Florida. The increasing concern of college administrators across the country over the growth in that category was reported in the March 28, 1990 issue of The Chronicle of Higher Education. Table 36 displays information from that article. Nationally,

TABLE 35

Professional Personnel Changes
Florida Community Colleges
1978-88

Professional Personnel	1978	1988	% Change
Full-Time Instructional	3,918	4,277	+ 9.2%
Executive, Administrative, Managerial	1,163	902	- 22.4%
Other Professional	696	1,552	+123.0%

TABLE 36

Professional Personnel Changes
U. S. Colleges and Universities
1975-85

Professional Personnel	1975	1985	% Change
Full-Time Instructional	446,830	473,537	+ 5.9%
Executive, Administrative, Managerial	102,465	120,585	+17.9%
Other Professional	166,487	268,225	+61.1%

the ten-year increase in the number of other professional personnel was 61.1 percent. Tables 35 and 36 can be compared, but the comparisons are not exact, because the ten-year periods differ, 1978-88 and 1975-85.

Equal Access

This report has addressed ethnic and gender matters as they have come up in the various sections of the report rather than separate them to address in a single section. However, there is an ethnic matter that calls for separate discussion. The Equal Access and Equal Opportunity Committee of the State Board of Community Colleges, with its advisers from the community colleges, monitors, evaluates, and recommends regarding equal access and equal opportunity. Each community college has a designated equal access and equal opportunity officer to assure that equity matters are recognized and addressed. The Department of Education has an equal educational opportunities unit with a staff of six. All these people, with many others, attend to advocacy, policy, planning, execution, training, and other elements associated with equal educational opportunity and representation. The evidence of activity is ample. The evidence of some success is there, although the success is not yet in proportion to the need.

The purpose in this section of this report is to emphasize an underlying principle in human relations. It is through direct interaction over time that people will develop sensitivity and understanding that will be ingrained to the point of replacing prejudice. While the myriad activities that are tangible and produce degrees of gratification continue and increase, we consciously should establish a strategy of persistent and pervasive structuring of the college environment to cause, not just allow, direct interaction among ethnic groups in every aspect of student life and personnel life.

Recommendation 27.-- Recommend that each community college establish and carry out a strategy of persistent and pervasive structuring of the college environment to bring about direct interaction among ethnic groups in all aspects of campus life.

SUMMARY

The statewide, state-level, issue-oriented, summative review of the associate in arts degree program in the State Community College System was to determine needs for state initiatives, policy changes, and funding priorities. The objectives included analysis to learn what the Level I and Level II reviews of the associate in arts degree program reveal, inquiry and analysis to identify conditions and trends in aspects of the program, inquiry and analysis to study nineteen issues, and the development of recommendations.

The "typical" community college student in the associate in arts degree program was described as twenty-five years old, female, white, part-time, employed, living off campus, probably in need of remediation, likely to change instructional program objectives, and likely to interrupt consecutive enrollment. Of the students who persist to earn the associate in arts degree, perhaps two-thirds go on toward the baccalaureate and achieve grade point averages about the same as the students who started out in four-year institutions.

The report urges interaction between community college faculty and State University System faculty. The report concludes that the grade distribution in associate in arts degree courses refutes the charge of grade inflation made by the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, but still bears monitoring by the colleges. The report raises questions about whether the skills examined on the College-Level Academic Skills Test are taught consistently in the courses the students are required to take, and if so, whether the degree of achievement of the skills is factored into the course grades. The report urges additional funding to improve the teaching and learning of the skills.

Enrollment in associate in arts degree programs was found to be increasing more consistently and rapidly than in vocational programs, and to constitute two-thirds of the total. Blacks, especially black males, were found to be underrepresented in associate in arts degree programs.

The report urges interaction between community college faculty and public school faculty. The report concludes that there are sufficient flaws in the identification of students in need of remediation that a comprehensive project fashioned after the initial College-Level Academic Skills Project should be undertaken. The report concludes that students with remediation needs at or below the eighth grade level should be referred to adult basic education.

The community colleges tend to view general education as a sampling of the liberal arts. Lack of precision in definition and purpose, coupled with its generally agreed importance and the radical changes in the world, suggest the need for a reconsideration of the general education core by each community college.

The report concludes that average class size in Gordon Rule English and mathematics courses exceeds the goal of twenty-two set by the legislature. The report concludes that 70 percent of all faculty are part-time faculty, but that full-time faculty are responsible for 70 percent of the advanced and professional instruction, which is the instruction that applies to the associate in arts degree. Class size and reliance on low cost, part-time faculty are influenced by the amount of operating funds.

The majority of the community colleges were found to believe that their faculty are able to keep up to date in their disciplines, which probably is due in large part to the community colleges assuming responsibility for helping faculty remain current by providing the time, the money, and the coordination for a wide variety of faculty development activities. The data system of the Division of Community Colleges should be designed to enable the study of faculty composition and attrition and of enrollment growth to plan for staffing needs.

The report urges the community colleges to ensure that basic library services are available to students at centers and other off-campus instructional sites. The legislature has provided $19,567,371 over the last five appropriations to supplement the acquisition of library print and nonprint materials.

The summative review of the associate in arts degree program involved extensive data gathering and study, which has increased our appreciation of the wealth of data that is available now and our awareness of the additional data that will become available soon with the completion of changes in the data collection system. The research resource of the data base is significant now, and will be even more so before the year is out. There are no research positions in the Division of Community Colleges. Such positions could be quite useful.

The most alarming conclusion in the report concerns the practice of basing the appropriations for the Community College Program Fund on less full-time equivalent student enrollment than actually occurs. For advanced and professional, all vocational, and all adult general education except lifelong learning, 14.57 percent of the FTE enrollment in 1989-90 was not state funded. That equates to $89,453,555. The shortfall the last four years equates to $197,333,091. It is hard to imagine how the cost cutting measures necessitated by four years of negative fiscal impact of this magnitude can avoid reducing quality. It is hard to imagine how this practice can continue without forcing the restriction of student admissions.

In conclusion, the program review questionnaire provided for the community colleges to culminate the thinking and searching through which they went to complete the questionnaire, which was no small task, by stating their comments or ideas about improving the associate in arts degree program. The responses helped in the mental preparation for the writing of this report and are recorded in appendix 4, item 24.

State of Florida
Department of Education
Betty Castor, Commissioner
Tallahassee, Florida
Affirmative action/equal opportunity employer

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FLORIDA STATE BOARD OF
COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Associate in Arts Degree Program

Program Review Report
Volume I I - The Appendix
February 1991

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

140 154

State Board of Community Colleges

Summative Review
# of the
Associate in Arts Degree Program
in
Florida Community Colleges

Volume II
The Appendix

February 1991

APPENDIX ONE

Associate in Arts Degree Program Review Task Force

Dr. Jon J. Alexiou
Vice President for Education
Miami-Dade Community College

Dr. Katherine E. Amos
Vice President, Academic Affairs
Broward Community College

Dr. Diane Brown
Coordinator, Equal Opportunity
Division of Community Colleges
(Has since left the Division)

Dr. Roy A. Church
Vice President, Educational and Student Services
St. Petersburg Junior College
(Has since left the college)

Dr. Patricia Dyer
Vice President, Academic Affairs
Palm Beach Community College

Dr. Lu Ellsworth
Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Programs
Division of Universities
(Has since left the Division)

Dr. Clifford Eubanks
Dean, College of Business Administration
University of Central Florida

Dr. Thomas E. Furlong, Jr.
Executive Director
Postsecondary Education Planning Commission
(Now Vice President, Educational Services, Tallahassee
Community College)

Dr. Patricia Hansen
Vice President, Academic Affairs
Daytona Beach Community College
(Has since left the college)

Dr. William D. Law, Jr.
Vice President, Institutional and Program Planning
St. Petersburg Junior College
(Has since left the college)

Dr. E. Timothy Lightfield
Vice President, Curriculum and Instruction
Florida Community College at Jacksonville
(Has since left the college)

Dr. John W. Muir
Vice President, Academic Affairs
Indian River Community College

Dr. Paul C. Parker
Chief, Bureau of Program Support and Services
Division of Community Colleges

Dr. Charles F. Sidman, Jr.
Dean, Liberal Arts and Sciences
University of Florida
(Now Professor of History)

Mr. Lew Wagar
Data Administrator
Division of Community Colleges
(Has since left the Division)

APPENDIX TWO

Advisory Committee for the Summative Review of the Associate in Arts Degree Program

Dr. Carolyn Allen
Provost, East Campus
Valencia Community College

Dr. James A. Durham
Dean of Instruction
Okaloosa-Walton Community College

Dr. Dennis P. Gallon
Dean, Liberal Arts and Sciences
Florida Community College at Jacksonville

Dr. Frank E. Juge
Associate Vice President, Academic Affairs
University of Central Florida

Dr. Dorothy L. Lord
Vice President, Academic Affairs
Edison Community College

Dr. Jeffrey Lukenbill
Dean, Academic Affairs
North Campus
Miami-Dade Community College

Dr. Linda A. Recio
Educational Policy Director
Postsecondary Education Planning Commission
(Has since left the Commission)

Dr. Keith T. Samuels
Vice President, Instruction
Seminole Community College

Mr. Edward B. Wiley
Dean, Academic Affairs
St. Johns River Community College

Dr. Denise Young
Specialist, Academic Programs
Division of Universities
(Has since left the Division)

APPENDIX THREE

____
Community College

Questionnaire

Summative Review of the A.A. Program

This questionnaire is part of the summative review of the associate in arts degree program, a level III program review which is issue oriented and statewide. The questionnaire is part of the information gathering process upon which to base deliberations and to develop recommendations.

Many of the questionnaire items require gathering information from various sources, and some may involve information infrequently studied. Please arrange to respond completely and accurately. We can promise the information will be used in the program review report and recommendations, and in other ways where accuracy and completeness will be very important. Four months are provided before the due date (October 1, 1989) in recognition of the difficulty in obtaining the data requested in a few of the items. With that allowance, all questionnaires are to be returned by the due date rather than after the due date.

The questionnaire items apply only to the associate in arts degree program unless otherwise indicated. When an item identifies a year, a report year is meant (summer, fall, winter). If the response to an item requires more space than is provided, attach the balance of the response to the questionnaire on a separate sheet. If you have questions, telephone Dr. Frederick W. Atherton, SC 278-0555 or (904) 488-0555.

RETURN THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE BY OCTOBER 1, 1989, TO:

Dr. Frederick W. Atherton
Division of Community Colleges
Knott Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

- -

1. a. How many students (unduplicated headcount) who indicated they were seeking the A.A. degree did you enroll in college preparatory instruction in the 1985-86 report year?

1985-86 ______

b. How many of the students in 1.a. had received their A.A. degrees by the end of the 1987-88 report year?

______

c. How many of the students in 1.a. were still enrolled, but had not received their A.A. degrees by the end of the 1987-88 report year?

______

2. What percent of your A.A. degree graduates in the following report years:

a. Entered Florida public universities?

1987-88 ______% 1986-87 ______%

b. Entered other baccalaureate institutions?

1987-88 ______% 1986-87 ______%

3. Are there any study designs, including your own, for obtaining items 1 and 2 information of which you are aware and consider to be models?

Yes ______ No ______

If yes, please identify the study designs.

Item 1.a. ______________________________

Item 1.b. ______________________________

Item 1.c. ______________________________

Item 2.a. ______________________________

Item 2.b. ______________________________

4. Is your college currently engaged in a study of its general education core?

Yes ______ No ______

5. Is your college engaged in any INNOVATIONS in the A.A. degree curriculum or instruction?

Yes ______ No ______

If yes, please ATTACH descriptions.

6. Which of the following methods of instruction are used in your A.A. degree program?

    a. Lecture ______
    b. Lecture/discussion ______
    c. Laboratory ______
    d. Closed circuit television instruction ______
    e. Broadcast television instruction ______
    f. Cooperative education ______
    g. Internship ______
    h. Learning laboratory group instruction ______
    i. Learning laboratory independent study ______
    j. Nonlearning laboratory independent study ______
    k. Overseas instruction in residence ______
    l. Overseas travel/tours ______
    m. Other (Identify)

7. Which of the following methods of recognizing prior learning and awarding credit are used in your A.A. degree program?

    a. Credit by examination ______
    b. Evaluation of experiential learning ______
    c. Credit for military schooling ______
    d. Credit for military service ______
    e. Credit for community service ______
    f. Other (Identify)

8. a. Has your college completed a formal process of restructuring the A.A. degree program to incorporate international education components?

    Yes ______ No ______

    If yes, please ATTACH descriptions of the components.

    b. Does your A.A. degree program contain a defined international education requirement?

    Yes ______ No ______

    If yes, please ATTACH a description of the requirement.

Questionnaire Continued
Summative Review of the A.A. Program

9. What are the grade distribution and frequency in courses that are part of the A.A. degree program? (Refer to the CCMIS manual for CCICS code and discipline cluster definitions.)

CCICS Code	Discipline Cluster		1987-88 A	B	C	D	F	Other*	Total
1.11	Natural Science	#							
		%							100
1.12	Fine & Applied Art	#							
		%							100
1.13	Letters & Foreign Language	#							
		%							100
1.14	Education	#							
		%							100
1.15	Business & Management	#							
		%							100
1.16	Math & Computer Science	#							
		%							100
1.17	Social Science	#							
		%							100
1.18	Other	#							
		%							100
	Totals	#							
		%							100
	Gordon Rule Writing Courses**	#							
		%							100
	Gordon Rule Math Courses**	#							
		%							100

* Place in this column the number for pass/fail, W, I, etc.

** These are included in the numbers for the coded clusters. Now, separate them out to report grade distribution and frequency in Gordon rule courses alone.

Questionnaire Continued
Summative Review of the A.A. Program

10. What enrollment (unduplicated headcount) and FTE have your college generated in A.A. degree program courses in other countries?

	1987-88		1986-87		1985-86	
	Hdcount	FTE	Hdcount	FTE	Hdcount	FTE
Instruction in Residence						
Travel/tours						
Totals						

11. Which of the following measures of institutional effectiveness does your college use to evaluate the results of its A.A. degree program and to plan for the improvement of its A.A. degree program?

a. Expected educational results are defined ______
b. How achievement of the expected educational results will be ascertained is specified ______
c. How findings are used is specified ______
d. Peer evaluation of the A.A. degree program is used ______
e. Structured interviews with students and graduates are used ______
f. Changes in students' values are measured ______
g. Pre- and post-testing of students is used ______
h. Surveys of graduates are used ______
i. Scores on standardized or locally constructed exams are used ______
j. Performance of graduates in the upper division is used ______
k. Continuous study, analysis, and appraisal of the A.A. degree program is conducted through structured institutional research ______
l. Other (Identify)

____

____

____

12. a. Does your college require A.A. degree program part-time faculty to schedule time for students outside of class?

Yes ______ No ______

b. If yes, how does your college assure that it is done?

____

____

13. a. Is orientation provided for A.A. degree program faculty?

New full-time faculty	Yes	______	No	______
Returning full-time faculty	Yes	______	No	______
New part-time faculty	Yes	______	No	______
Returning part-time faculty	Yes	______	No	______

b. What constitutes faculty orientation at your college?

____

____

____

14. In your college's A.A. degree program, how many class sections and students were taught by full-time and by part-time faculty and how many student semester hours (SSH) were produced by full-time and by part-time faculty in each discipline cluster during the 1987-88 report year?

		Full-time			Part-time		
CCICS Code	Discipline Cluster	Sect	Dup Hdcnt	SSH	Sect	Dup Hdcnt	SSH
1.11	Natural Science						
1.12	Fine & Applied Art						
1.13	Letters & Foreign Language						
1.14	Education						
1.15	Business & Management						
1.16	Math & Computer Science						
1.17	Social Science						
1.18	Other						
	Totals						
	Gordon Rule Writing Courses*						
	Gordon Rule Math Courses*						

* These are included in the numbers for the coded clusters. Now, separate them out to report the information for Gordon rule courses alone.

15. What support services are provided A.A. degree program faculty?

	Full-time Faculty	Part-time Faculty
Audiovisual production		
Duplicating		
Grading exams		
Lab assistants		
Office space		
Personal computers		
Typing		
Other (Identify)		

16. Which of the following A.A. degree program faculty development activities are paid for by your college?

	Full-time Faculty	Part-time Faculty
Consultants		
Courses		
Guest speakers		
Meetings with upper division faculty		
Professional meetings		
Visits to other community colleges		
Workshops		
Other (Identify)		

17. List the disciplines in the A.A. degree program where the faculty have difficulty keeping current.

18. ATTACH the criteria your college has adopted and uses, pursuant to Rule 6A-14.060(3), for A.A. degree program faculty selection, evaluation, development, retention, and dismissal.

19. Which of the following services are provided A.A. degree program students on-site at campuses, centers, and other instructional sites where the A.A. program is offered?

	Campuses	Centers	Other A.A. Prog. Sites
Academic Advising	______	______	______
Student access to computers	______	______	______
Library services orientation	______	______	______
Library reference collection	______	______	______
Library research assistance	______	______	______
Library bibliography/catalog	______	______	______
Library print materials	______	______	______
Library nonprint materials	______	______	______
Library equipment for using nonprint materials	______	______	______
Interlibrary loan	______	______	______

20. Does your college measure the effectiveness of library services on:

Campuses	Yes	______	No	______
Centers	Yes	______	No	______
Other A.A. program sites	Yes	______	No	______

If yes, please ATTACH an explanation of how.

21. The Community College Information Classification Structure (CCICS) places learning resources as a subfunction under the academic support function. Learning resources includes libraries, audiovisual services, museums and galleries, planetariums, and auditoriums. Report all learning resources expenditures for the report years indicated.

	1987-88	1986-87	1985-86
Library	$	$	$
Audiovisual services			
Museums and galleries			
Planetariums			
Auditoriums			
Totals	$	$	$

22. For review comparison, what is the average age of students enrolled in each of the following classifications for the report years indicated?

	1987-88	1986-87	1985-86
A.A. degree program			
A.S. degree programs			
Postsecondary adult vocational programs			

23. How would you judge the adequacy of A.A. degree program academic advising at campuses, centers, and other instructional sites where the A.A. program is offered?

	Campuses	Centers	Other A.A. Prog. Sites
Very good			
Good			
Satisfactory			
Poor			
Very poor			

If you indicated good or very good, to what do you attribute that effectiveness?

24. The thinking and searching through which you have gone to complete this questionnaire may have excited you to think of ways to improve the A.A. degree program, or you may have had such ideas all along. If so, please tell us those thoughts, ideas.

HAVE YOU REMEMBERED TO ATTACH THE INFORMATION REQUESTED?

Prepared by ______________________ Telephone __________

Date ______________

APPENDIX FOUR

Responses to the Questionnaire
Summative Review of the
Associate in Arts Degree Program

Individual responses are listed
in random order or are aggregated

1. a. How many first-time-in-college students (unduplicated headcount) who indicated they were seeking the A.A. degree did you enroll in college preparatory instruction in the 1985-86 report year?

308

196

Not available

8514

322

428

Not available

301

484

Not available

63

1130

Not provided

1036

161

1250

2016

1037

839

405

69

1072

285

1081

63

236

911

555

22,762 in 24 colleges

1. b. How many of the students in 1.a. had received their A.A. degrees by the end of the 1987-88 report year?

5	(7.9%)
11	(4.7%)
29	(3.2%)
51	(9.2%)
87	(28%)
9	(4.6%)
Not available	
512	(6%)
197	(61%)
25	(5.8%)
Not available	
5	(7.9%)
187	(16.5%)
Not available	
110	(10.6%)
16	(9.9%)
300	(24%)
128	(6.3%)
68	(6.6%)
85	(10.1%)
0	(0%)
13	(18.8%)
97	(9%)
47	(16%)
76	(7%)
Not available	
41	(13.6%)
29	(6%)

2,128 for the same colleges as in 1.a. (9.35%)

1. c. How many of the students in 1.a. were still enrolled, but had not received their A.A. degrees by the end of the 1987-88 report year?

Not available	
58	(19%)
157	(32%)
Not available	
27	(43%)
371	(33%)
Not available	
251	(24%)
140	(87%)
150	(12%)
Not available	
116	(27%)
21	(6.5%)
3477	(41%)
Not available	
41	(21%)
112	(36%)
214	(39%)
230	(25%)
72	(31%)
22	(35%)
208	(19%)
136	(48%)
332	(31%)
24	(35%)
99	(24%)
330	(39%)
137	(13%)

6,725 for the same colleges as in 1.a. except for one college. (32.42%)

Item One Summary

Using the twenty-three colleges that responded to all three parts of item one, we find:

20,608 were enrolled in college preparatory instruction in 1985-86.

1,990 (9.66%) of them had graduated by the end of 1987-88.

6,666 (32.35%) of them had not graduated by the end of 1987-88, but were still enrolled.

11,952 (58.00%) of them had not graduated and were not enrolled in 1987-88.

2. a. What percent of your A.A. degree graduates in the following report years entered Florida public universities?

1987-88	1986-87
7%	9%
38%	41%
38%	46%
47%	46%
51%	60%
54%	55%
59%	58%
60%	58%
60%	60%
61%	70%
61%	71%
62%	77%
63%	57%
63%	65%
65%	66%
73%	75%
74%	70%
77%	76%
Not available	3.9%
Not available	Not available
Not available	Not available
Not available	Not available
Not available	Not available
Not available	Not available
Not available	Not available
Not available	Not available
Not available	Not available
Not available	Not available

2. b. What percent of your A.A. degree graduates in the following report years entered other baccalaureate institutions? (Other than SUS institutions.)

1987-88	1986-87
1.94%	1.62%
2%	1%
2.3%	2.3%
3%	3%
4%	4%
6%	2%
10%	10%
10%	10%
10%	13%
19%	18%
Not available	0%
Not available	Not available
Not available	Not available
Not available	Not available
Not available	Not available
Not available	Not available
Not available	Not available
Not available	Not available
Not available	Not available
Not available	Not available
Not available	Not available
Not available	Not available
Not available	Not available
Not available	Not available
Not available	Not available
Not available	Not available
Not available	Not available
Not available	Not available

3. Are there any study designs, including your own, for obtaining items 1 and 2 information of which you are aware and consider to be models?

   a. Broward Community College has printed a report, "College Preparatory Instruction and Student Persistence." The reference is Institutional Research Report Abstract RR 89-14.

   b. Two colleges mentioned follow-up questionnaires.

   c. Two colleges mentioned the A.A. Level I data displays.

   d. Tracking systems are under development at Tallahassee and Valencia Community Colleges.

   e. Miami-Dade Community College has printed a report, "Student Success at Miami-Dade Community College: Issues and Data." The reference is Institutional Research Report No. 86-22.

4. Is your college currently engaged in a study of its general education core?

Yes	No
19 colleges	9 colleges

5. Is your college engaged in any INNOVATIONS in the A.A. degree curriculum or instruction?

Yes	No
17 colleges	11 colleges

6. Which of the following methods of instruction are used in your A.A. degree program?

28	Lecture
28	Lecture/Discussion
28	Laboratory
18	Closed Circuit TV
21	Broadcast TV
19	Cooperative Education
13	Internship
23	Learning Laboratory Group Instruction
27	Learning Laboratory Independent Study
20	Nonlearning Laboratory Independent Study
5	Overseas Instruction in Residence
17	Overseas Tours
3	Other:

Demonstrations
Field Trips
Correspondence
Clinical

7. Which of the following methods of recognizing prior learning and awarding credit are used in your A.A. degree program?

28	Credit by Examination
12	Evaluation of Experiential Learning
18	Credit for Military Schooling
8	Credit for Military Service
2	Credit for Community Service
3	Other:

Industry Schools
National Management Association Program
Apprentice Experience

8. a. Has your college completed a formal process of restructuring the A.A. degree program to incorporate international education components?

Yes	No
2 colleges	26 colleges (But in process at one of these.)

8. b. Does your A.A. degree program contain a defined international education requirement?

Yes	No
1 college	27 colleges

9. What are the grade distribution and frequency in courses that are part of the A.A. degree program? (Refer to the CCMIS manual for CCICS code and discipline cluster definitions.)

CCICS Code	Discipline Cluster		1987-88							
			A	B	C	D	F	Other*	Cluster Total	% of Grand Total
1.11	Natural Science	#	32,072	38,536	35,978	11,753	9,382	31,553	159,274	15.02%
		%	20.14	24.19	22.59	7.38	5.89	19.81	100	
1.12	Fine and Applied Art	#	25,246	15,880	8,396	1,913	2,455	11,586	65,476	6.17%
		%	38.56	24.25	12.82	2.92	3.75	17.70	100	
1.13	Letters and Foreign Language	#	55,124	72,879	57,789	13,106	18,078	60,243	277,219	26.15%
		%	19.88	26.29	20.85	4.73	6.52	21.73	100	
1.14	Education	#	37,113	19,810	9,677	1,239	2,629	13,821	84,289	7.95%
		%	44.03	23.50	11.48	1.47	3.12	16.40	100	
1.15	Business and Management	#	5,147	5,179	3,880	1,174	1,570	4,427	21,377	2.02%
		%	24.08	24.23	18.15	5.49	7.34	20.71	100	
1.16	Math and Computer Science	#	28,494	33,467	33,898	12,306	15,827	55,271	179,263	16.91%
		%	15.90	18.67	18.91	6.86	8.83	30.83	100	
1.17	Social Science	#	50,197	57,621	49,225	12,542	13,008	36,160	218,753	20.63%
		%	22.95	26.34	22.50	5.73	5.95	16.53	100	
1.18	Other	#	14,287	15,205	9,841	2,349	3,434	9,532	54,648	5.15%
		%	26.14	27.82	18.01	4.30	6.29	17.44	100	
	Total	#	247,680	258,577	208,684	56,382	66,383	222,593	1,060,299	100%
		%	23.36	24.39	19.68	5.32	6.26	20.99	100	
	Gordon Rule Writing Courses**	#	54,479	78,807	68,903	15,522	21,118	57,017	295,846	27.90%
		%	18.41	26.64	23.29	5.25	7.14	19.27	100	
	Gordon Rule Math Courses**	#	17,392	21,963	23,558	7,918	9,251	32,275	112,357	10.60%
		%	15.48	19.55	20.97	7.05	8.23	28.72	100	

* Place in this column the number for pass/fail, W, I, etc.

** These are included in the numbers for the coded clusters. Now separate them out to report grade distribution and frequency in Gordon rule courses alone.

10. What enrollment (unduplicated headcount) and FTE have your college generated in A.A. degree program courses in other countries?

1987-88		1986-87		1985-86	
Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
102	2.5	87	2.2	156	3.9
17	1.3	0	0	22	1.7
9	1.35	0	0	7	1.05
70	5.3	118	9.1	133	12.5
0	0	0	0	2	.15
5	.6	0	0	5	.6
453	33.6	411	30.5	834	62.3
86	4.77	55	2.95	65	3.6
59	8.8	66	9.9	35	5.5
64	9.75	82	10.95	49	7.35
2	.3	0	0	0	0
141	10.6	0	0	2	.1
16	1.2	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	4	.3
121	23.37	129	29.7	158	38.9
142	21.3	152	22.8	179	26.85
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
		Not Available			
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
1,282	124.74	1,100	118.1	1,651	164.8

11. Which of the following measures of institutional effectiveness does your college use to evaluate the results of its A.A. degree program and to plan for the improvement of its A.A. degree program?

21	Expected educational results are defined.
17	How achievement of the expected educational results will be ascertained is specified.
12	How findings are used is specified.
11	Peer evaluation of the A.A. degree program is used.
6	Structured interviews with students and graduates are used.
1	Changes in students' values are measured.
17	Pre- and post-testing of students is used.
22	Surveys of graduates are used.
27	Scores on standardized or locally constructured exams are used.
27	Performance of graduates in the upper division is used.
17	Continuous study, analysis, and appraisal of the A.A. degree program is conducted through structured institutional research.
2	Other:

Each academic unit is charged with completing an annual review and evaluation.

Program review within academic departments.

12. a. Does your college require A.A. degree program part-time faculty to schedule time for students outside of class?

Yes	No
21 colleges	7 colleges

12. b. If yes, how does your college assure that it is done?

1. Academic deans oversee.
2. Monitored by department chairmen.
3. Department chairmen assure that course outlines indicate the availability of the part-time instructor.
4. Inform them of the requirement.
5. Monitored by supervisor.
6. Random checks by division chairmen.
7. Part-time faculty give notice of office hours to students and their academic director who is responsible for monitoring.
8. Department chairmen assign office hours.
9. Periodic checks by division chairmen.
10. Inform them of the requirement.
11. Department chairmen assure that office hours are scheduled, posted, and announced to students in class.
12. Coordinated by supervisors.
13. One hour per week per course is required.
14. Student feedback is used to assess availability.
15. Observation by division directors and evaluation by students.
16. Provide office space and compensation.
17. Office hour schedules are approved and monitored by program directors.
18. Office space is provided and load sheets indicate hours.
19. Supervision by department chairmen.
20. Office hour documentation and conferences between department chairmen and the part-time faculty.
21. ---
22. ---
23. ---
24. ---
25. ---
26. ---
27. ---
28. ---

13. a. Is orientation provided for A.A. degree program faculty?

New Faculty

Full-time		Part-time	
Yes	No	Yes	No
28	0	28	0

Returning Faculty

Full-time		Part-time	
Yes	No	Yes	No
25	3	26	2

13. b. What constitutes faculty orientation at your college?

1. Presentations on policies, instructional issues, and benefits.
2. Meetings with new faculty and guiding new faculty through course syllabi.
3. A faculty meeting to discuss academic policies, college procedures, problems, and to conduct a faculty development activity.
4. Regularly scheduled meetings for full-time faculty.
5. Specific topics covered at department level with college-wide meetings called by the president for other matters.
6. College-wide and department faculty meetings. Mentor system.
7. College-wide faculty meetings and discipline faculty meetings.
8. Division meetings, adjunct resource coordinator meetings and information services.
9. Two-day orientation for new faculty.
10. New full-time faculty meet with supervisors. Faculty meetings for returning full-timers. Orientation sessions each term for part-timers.
11. A series of meetings for full-time faculty. A three-hour meeting each major term for part-time faculty.
12. Faculty meetings at start of fall term, then as needed.
13. Individual meetings of faculty with department chairmen.
14. For new faculty, one-week orientation program at the start of the year, mentors, and two-hour meetings each month the first year.
15. For full-time, a one-day session for new faculty and a two-day session for new and returning. Conferences. Department meetings. For part-time faculty, a workshop.
16. For full-time, formal meetings and individual conferences. For part-time, an orientation handbook and individual conferences.
17. For full-time, faculty meetings and division meetings each term. For part-time, orientation by division chair.
18. Group and individual meetings with dean and department chairs. Orientation sessions with academic vice president.
19. Formal orientation sessions on in-service days before the start of each major term.
20. For part-time, an orientation session one evening. For full-time, a one-day workshop and division meetings.
21. Group meetings and conferences with supervisors.
22. Workshops and individual meetings with supervisors.
23. A planned orientation program for new full-time faculty. The handbook is reviewed with part-time faculty.
24. Orientation sessions with human resources office, with chairs and deans, and with district academic affairs office.
25. Faculty receive curriculum guides, catalogs, faculty handbooks, procedure handbooks, and advisement training.
26. Planning conferences during first duty days each contract year.
27. New faculty have a one-day meeting.
28. Full-time - one-day orientation each year. Part-time - sessions on each campus. Returning faculty - division meeting

14. In your college's A.A. degree program, how many class sections and students were taught by full-time and part-time faculty and how many student semester hours (SSH) were produced by full-time and part-time faculty in each discipline cluster during the 1987-88 report year?

			Full-Time				Part-Time			
CCICS Code	Discipline Cluster		Sections	Dup Hdcount	Students Per Sect	SSH	Sections	Dup Hdcount	Students Per Sect	SSH
1.11	Natural Science	#	4,865	116,414	23.93	294,907	1,386	29,143	21.03	65,042
		%	77.83	79.98		81.93	22.17	20.02		18.07
1.12	Fine and Applied Art	#	3,497	40,937	11.71	99,104	1,920	20,304	10.58	42,025
		%	64.56	66.85		70.22	35.44	33.15		29.78
1.13	Letters and Foreign Language	#	7,814	162,992	20.86	453,303	3,573	72,660	20.34	205,494
		%	68.62	69.17		68.81	31.38	30.83		31.19
1.14	Education	#	2,438	49,045	20.12	72,809	1,288	26,168	20.32	34,353
		%	65.43	65.21		67.94	34.57	34.79		32.06
1.15	Business and Management	#	780	14,716	18.87	44,131	450	8,406	18.68	25,365
		%	63.41	63.65		63.50	36.59	36.35		36.50
1.16	Math and Computer Science	#	4,595	112,448	24.47	330,687	2,046	46,818	22.88	128,344
		%	69.19	70.60		72.04	30.81	29.40		27.96
1.17	Social Science	#	5,720	152,062	26.58	423,345	2,060	48,011	23.31	131,604
		%	73.52	76.00		76.29	26.48	24.00		23.71
1.18	Other	#	1,629	36,764	22.57	119,973	546	11,312	20.72	29,232
		%	74.90	76.47		80.41	25.10	23.53		19.59
	Total	#	31,338	685,378	21.87	1,838,259	13,269	262,822	19.81	661,459
		%	70.25	72.28		73.54	29.75	27.72		26.46
	Gordon Rule Writing Courses*	#	7,449	197,299	26.49	568,951	2,791	63,665	22.81	193,128
		%	72.74	75.60		74.66	27.26	24.40		25.34
	Gordon Rule Math Courses*	#	2,931	75,125	25.63	228,705	1,251	29,208	23.35	83,376
		%	70.09	72.01		73.28	29.91	27.99		26.72

* These are included in the numbers for the coded clusters. Now, separate them out to report the information for Gordon rule courses alone.

Item Fourteen Additional Information

Faculty Headcount

October 1, 1987		October 1, 1988	
Full-Time	Part-Time	Full-Time	Part-Time
4,483	10,782	4,529	10,592
29.37%	70.63%	29.95%	70.05%

15. What support services are provided A.A. degree program faculty?

	Full-time Faculty	Part-time Faculty
AV Production	27	27
Duplicating	28	28
Exam Grading	13	12
Lab Assistants	27	25
Office Space	28	14
Personal Computer	25	13
Typing	27	24
Other:		
Library Research	2	1
Testing Center	1	1
Test Item Bank	1	1

16. Which of the following A.A. degree program faculty development activities are paid for by your college?

	Full-time Faculty	Part-time Faculty
Consultants	24	18
Courses	27	10
Guest speakers	26	19
Meetings with upper division faculty	27	10
Professional meetings	28	10
Visits to colleges	28	7
Workshops	27	19
Other:		
Teleconferences	2	1
Fine arts performances	1	1
Sabbatical leaves	2	
Subscriptions to professional journals	1	1

17. List the disciplines in the A.A. degree program where the faculty have difficulty keeping current.

4	Natural sciences
2	Biology
2	Chemistry
2	Physics
2	Environmental science
1	Sciences
5	Computer science
1	Pre-engineering
1	Education
2	Applications of technology in all disciplines
1	All disciplines
16	None

18. ATTACH the criteria your college has adopted and uses, pursuant to Rule 6A-14.060(3), for degree program faculty selection, evaluation, development, retention, and dismissal.

Twenty-two of the twenty-eight questionnaires returned had criteria attached. The information does not lend itself to summarization of the sort in this package.

19. Which of the following services are provided A.A. degree program students on-site at campuses, centers, and other instructional sites where the A.A. program is offered?

	Campuses	Centers	Other Instructional Sites
Academic advising	28	20	10
Student access to computers	27	17	5
Library services orientation	28	13	3
Library reference collection	28	14	3
Library research assistance	27	11	2
Library bibliography catalog	28	12	4
Library print materials	28	14	4
Library nonprint materials	28	16	4
Library equipment to use nonprint materials	27	15	5
Interlibrary loan	26	14	5

20. Does your college measure the effectiveness of library services on:

	Yes	No
Campuses	21	7
Centers	9	19
Other instructional sites	3	25

20. If yes, please ATTACH an explanation of how.

Instructor and student and administrator questionnaires.

User questionnaire.

Assessment conducted in three phases for three years plus follow-up assessment.

Surveys of students and faculty.

Monthly utilization reports.

Instructor and student questionnaires.

Subject specialists on the library staff.

A college-wide library task force.

SACS visiting team evaluation. An alternate year survey of users. An active Learning Resources Committee.

User surveys.

Student questionnaire.

Faculty and staff and student surveys. Focused surveys of specific library service areas.

Student questionnaires.

(The remaining fifteen colleges did not respond.)

21. The Community College Information Classification Structure (CCICS) places learning resources as a subfunction under the academic support function. Learning resources includes libraries, audiovisual services, museums and galleries, planetariums, and auditoriums. Report all learning resources expenditures for the report years indicated. (The responses include four colleges that did not include salaries in their calculation.)

	1987-88		1986-87		1985-86
	Amount	% Change	Amount	% Change	Amount
Library (26 responses)	$15,217,696	+6.38%	$14,304,378	+9.02%	$13,120,817
Audiovisual Services (19 responses)	6,533,415	+6.96%	6,108,539	+9.81%	5,562,911
Museums and Galleries (7 responses)	360,374	+14.22%	315,511	-9.45%	348,442
Planetariums (6 responses)	472,136	+95.65%	241,312	-23.54%	315,617
Auditoriums (11 responses)	853,775	-41.42%	1,457,546	-30.26%	2,089,865
Total (28 responses)	$25,162,008	+5.23%	$23,911,329	+4.53%	$22,875,138

Note: The 1987 Legislature provided $1,910,500 in additional special purpose funds for library materials, and the 1986 Legislature provided $1,000,000 in additional special purpose funds for library materials.

22. For review comparison, what is the average age of students enrolled in each of the following classifications for the report years indicated?

1987-88			1986-87			1985-86		
AA	AS	PAV	AA	AS	PAV	AA	AS	PAV
22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
22	25	NA	22	25	NA	22	26	NA
22	30	37	21	29	37	20	29	35
23	28	NA	23	27	NA	23	27	NA
23	28	NA	23	28	NA	23	28	NA
24	28	NA	24	28	NA	25	27	NA
24	30	NA	24	32	NA	24	33	NA
24	31	28	26	31	30	26	32	31
25	29	18	24	31	21	24	31	24
25	29	34	23	27	35	25	29	NA
25	29	NA	25	29	NA	25	29	NA
25	30	29	26	30	30	28	31	30
25	30	31	26	30	31	26	30	31
25	31	33	24	31	33	25	32	32
25	31	NA	25	30	NA	24	30	NA
26	26	?	25	25	?	25	25	?
26	28	NA	26	27	NA	25	27	NA
27	?	NA	27	?	NA	27	?	NA
27	28	31	28	26	29	28	27	29
27	29	35	27	29	35	27	29	35
27	33	33	26	30	31	25	30	33
27	35	?	27	36	?	27	36	?
28	31	?	29	32	?	30	33	?
29	31	37	30	32	39	31	31	33
32	32	?	34	34	?	34	34	?
Not Available			Not Available			Not Available		
Not Available			Not Available			Not Available		
Not Available			Not Available			Not Available		

23. How would you judge the adequacy of A.A. degree program academic advising at campuses, centers, and other instructional sites where the A.A. program is offered?

Campuses	Centers	Other Sites
Very good	Very good	
Very good	Very good	Very good
Very good	Good	
Very good	Very good	Very good
Very good	Very good	
Very good	Very good	Very good
Very good	Very good	Very good
Very good	Very good	Very good
Very good	Good	
Very good		Very good
Very good	Good	
Good	Good	Satisfactory
Good		
Good		
Good	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Good		Good
Good	Poor	Poor
Good		
Good	Good	Good
Good	Good	
Good	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Good	Good	Satisfactory
Good	Good	
Good		
Good	Good	
Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Satisfactory		

(11 Very Good)

(14 Good)

(3 Satisfactory)

23. If you indicated good or very good, to what do you attribute that effectiveness?

Counselors and/or program advisors are available day and evening.

Continuous training of advisors.

The structure of college orientation and academic advisement for all new students.

Small college. Instructors participate in advising. Instructors receive training in advising.

Commitment of faculty to students.

Use of computer support and assessment.

Well trained, interested professional counselors whose primary responsibility is advising.

Faculty consider advising to be important responsibility.

Separate advisors and counselors. Regularly scheduled meetings between administrators, faculty, and full-time counselors.

Sufficient number of advisors.

On campus, counselors are augmented by faculty advisors matched with students according to students' educational goals.

Dedicated staff, good faculty involvement and cooperation.

Progress tracking report to students each term. Institutional commitment.

A computerized and up-to-date advisement and graduation system and academic alert system.

Small college. Advisors know most students. We take time to assure proper advising.

New student orientation. Faculty advisors matched with students according to educational goals. Program plans reviewed by registrar.

Advisement manual. Evaluation by students. Staff training. SUS counseling manuals. Wide information dissemination.

Availability and ease of access to advisors and counselors. Use of advisement data from computerized registration system.

Advising only by counselors with computer access to student records.

Staff knowledge and effort. Articulation with SUS. Individual student program evaluation report each semester.

A computerized system of academic advisement with full-time paraprofessionals. Necessary resources are committed to it.

Small college. Counselors sign registration forms, are available, have current information, and have time. Advisement forms. Orientation.

Trained advisors with Counseling Center support. Advising is a discrete, reward activity.

Qualified personnel interested in serving students.

(Too numerous to extract a brief statement.)

24. The thinking and searching through which you have gone to complete this questionnaire may have excited you to think of ways to improve the A.A. degree program, or you may have had such ideas all along. If so, please tell us those thoughts, ideas.

Seventeen of the twenty-eight colleges responded to this item. Summary information follows.

1. Planning a study of general education requirements. Implementing more formal institutional research.

2. Working at specifying learning outcomes and identifying ways to measure and evaluate them. Will use our responses to some of these items to ask further questions of ourselves.

3. Important to look at general education as a whole in addition to looking at disciplines separately.

4. Develop a model A.A. program. Provide categorical funding for institutional researchers.

5. Emphasize academic excellence. Approach external restrictions so as to convert them to opportunities.

6. Explore interdisciplinary program approaches. Integrate comparative data with curriculum planning.

7. Address international education, experiential learning, special topics, and adaptive scheduling.

8. Focus on advising, teaching, and student support.

9. Provide released time for a math teacher and an English teacher to serve as coordinators for CLAST development.

10. Research entry/exit testing, track curriculum patterns and CLAST performance.

11. Thinking of an ethics course in the general education core.

12. The value of enhancement funding and of strong academic advisement.

13. Thinking through the purpose of a liberal arts education.

14. Affective/attitude changes in students, synthesis of knowledge and information, critical thinking, breadth for exploration.

15. Tie the reporting of data on CLAST, upper division performance, placement, etc. to students who complete sixty credits at the given institution.

16. Faculty and staff recruitment problems. Appropriate teaching loads. Telephone registration. Transfer follow-up. Interactive assessment and testing center. Graduation check system.

24. Continued

17. Conducting a five-year A.A. degree review. Looking at course patterns to investigate relationship to upper division success.

APPENDIX FIVE

Key to Symbols on Level I Program Review Data Displays

The data displays signal variations from predetermined performance parameters with an "x" or "*," referred to as flags and defined as follows.

Group A. -- Group A indicators do not compare the upper division performance of community college AA graduates with other university students. Variation from the indicators is flagged with an x.

1. At least 25% of the community college AA graduates in an upper division discipline group have a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or above in the upper division. (Column 3.)
2. No more than 10% of the community college AA graduates in an upper division discipline group have a cumulative GPA below 2.0 in the upper division. (Column 4.)
3. No more than 5% of the community college AA graduates in an upper division discipline group are suspended during the report period. (Column 5.)
4. At least 25% of the community college AA graduates in an upper division discipline group graduate during the report period. (Column 6.)

Group B. -- Group B indicators compare the upper division performance of community college AA graduates with other university students. Variation from the indicators is flagged with an *.

1. The mean cumulative GPA of community college AA graduates is within .25 of the mean cumulative GPA of other upper division students. (Column 2.)
2. The percentage of community college AA graduates with a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or above is within 5 points of the percentage of other upper division students with such a GPA. (Column 3.)
3. The percentage of community college AA graduates with a cumulative GPA below 2.0 is within 5 points of the percentage of other upper division students with such a GPA. (Column 4.)
4. The percentage of community college AA graduates who are suspended for academic reasons during the report period is within 5 points of the percentage of other upper division students who are so suspended. (Column 5.)
5. The percentage of the community college AA graduates who graduate during the report period is within 5 points of the percentage of other upper division students who so graduate.
6. The average total SSH earned by community college AA graduates to graduate during the report period is within 15 credits of the average total SSH earned by other upper division students to so graduate. (Column 8.)

APPENDIX SIX

Results of Articulation Meetings
Level II A. A. Program Review

1987-88

1. A consortium of central Florida institutions to facilitate articulation.

2. Review of the recommended lower division courses for prospective business majors.

3. Review of science requirements for secondary education majors.

4. Agreement to provide the academic discipline courses required in the Advanced Vocational Teacher certification program.

5. Cooperation on a Title II grant for the training of public school teachers.

6. A common weekend college program allowing 2 + 2 access.

7. Review of the 2 + 2 program for elementary education majors.

8. Agreement for the provision of lower division courses for DOT personnel in a pilot civil and environmental engineering program.

9. Identification of the baccalaureate programs that can be completed in the college district without commuting to the university campus.

10. Negotiation for a greater role in the teacher education center.

11. Articulation arrangments with a private college.

12. Faculty recruiting.

13. Determination of expectations of incoming juniors in information science.

14. The matching of organic chemistry courses.

15. Review of lower division computer science course content.

16. Review of lower division mathematics course requirements.

17. Determination of expectation of incoming juniors in mathematics and science and improved sequencing of courses.

18. Strengthened math and science foundations courses for prospective engineering majors.

19. Knowledge of changes in program requirements of upper division programs in business and music.

20. Correlated courses and textbooks in chemistry.

21. Knowledge of admission requirements for the economics major and of recent economics curriculum changes, also history, psychology, and sociology.

22. Agreement to accept selected courses in transfer.

23. Revision of the mathematics curriculum.

24. One-to-one interaction between faculty members to discuss curriculum, textbooks, and expectations.

25. Recognition of the benefits of faculty-to-faculty meetings as stimulation for scheduling such meetings regularly.

26. Methods for improving the teaching of English and for increasing comparability of courses.

27. Arrangements for sharing laboratory space.

28. Increased comparability of selected courses.

29. Course modifications to facilitate acceptance in transfer.

30. Transfer agreements for certain A.S. degree programs.

31. Smoother transition of honors students into SUS honors programs.

32. Development of a survey course in communications to teach the fundamentals of communication and to explore the various career specialities.

33. Personal relationships with selected limited access upper division program faculty and student activities.

34. A foundations of education course.

35. A joint workshop on the teaching of freshman composition.

36. An essay contest.

37. Development of an ethics course.

38. A study of public service applicability to graduation requirements.

39. Redesigned calculus courses.

40. Review and modification of computer and mathematics courses for prospective engineering majors.

41. Arrangements for faculty exchange.

42. Recognition of grossly inadequate technological and scientific equipment.

43. Expanded foreign language courses.

1988-89

1. Scheduled a follow-up meeting.

2. Assessing feasibility of establishing a 3 + 1 program in surveying and mapping with the U of F.

3. Study the possibility of an articulation agreement with the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities.

4. Study the possibility of an articulation agreement with St. Thomas University.

5. An articulation agreement with Nova University.

6. Changed four foreign language courses to four-credit courses.

7. Work on an articulation agreement with FIT.

8. Plan cooperative ventures with FIU and Barry University.

9. Establish a business calculus course.

10. Review hospitality program curriculum with advisory committee.

11. Established an FTA chapter.

12. Plan cooperative ventures with FAU.

13. An agriculture articulation agreement with the UF.

14. Developed a 2 + 2 brochure.

15. Mathematics and statistics course changes accomplished.

16. Revised course guide for education majors.

17. Designated a faculty advisor for English majors.

18. Improved understanding of upper division program requirements.

19. Distribution of information materials.

20. Changed course description.

21. Verification of SOLAR information.

22. Share adjunct faculty lists.

23. Revise first-year foreign language courses.

24. Increased contact hours for two physics courses.

25. Survey of extent of AIDS instruction in introductory biology.

26. Revised program for elementary education majors.

27. Developed two physical science survey courses for elementary education majors.

28. Designed an honors program.

29. Developed and offered a new religion course.

30. Increased foreign language courses to four credits and added intermediate courses.

31. Trigonometry now required for Calculus I.

32. Establish chapter of Florida Future Educators.

33. Two courses developed.

34. Addition of debate to the curriculum.

35. Made information changes in the Advisement Graduation Information System.

36. Changed the first digit in the course numbers of selected literature courses.

37. Increased foreign language courses to four credits.

38. Revised computer science program.

39. Made curriculum changes in mathematics courses.

40. Begin agriculture program development.

41. Develop a 2 + 2 program in hazardous materials management.

42. Program revised for education majors.

43. Developed new agriculture courses.

44. Revised college algebra course content.

45. Developed a program for international business majors.

46. Decision of UCF to offer graduate courses in math specifically for community college faculty.

47. A one-day workshop for math faculty on the use of computers and calculators in teaching.

48. Developed four courses in film.

49. Developed a computer science articulation agreement with FSU.

50. Plan a high achievers conference.

51. Joint workshop for composition faculty.

APPENDIX SEVEN

Needs Recommended for Consideration Level II A. A. Program Review Articulation Meetings

1987-88

1. Establish uniform A. A. degree requirements.

2. Extra funds are needed to meet science needs.

3. Identify the colleges as the primary providers of subject field instruction for teacher certification, recertification, and academic updating. Professional education instruction is the domaine of the colleges of education.

4. Help establish guidelines for teacher refresher courses in math, science, and computer science.

5. Promote articulated programs that feature alternative learning systems.

6. Identify sources for grants to provide instruction for state agency personnel.

7. Provide for community colleges to be funded providers of instruction through teacher education centers.

8. Investigate community college transfer students being required to repeat traditional lower division courses under upper division numbers.

9. Oppose the practice of university departments testing to authenticate grades awarded in lower division courses offered at community colleges as is the case in accounting at FIU.

10. Sponsor articulation opportunities between junior and senior level institutions.

11. Foster the employment by the community colleges of Ph.D. graduates.

12. Two semesters of business law should be accepted in transfer by the universities.

13. Adjust standards to equal those of the universities.

14. Encourage universities to offer courses on community college campuses.

15. Develop a procedure for regular notification of changes in upper division requirements.

16. Disseminate widely the state level decisions on articulation matters and enforce them.

17. Provide funds for institutions to pay for articulation activities.

18. Promote the sharing of information between institutions.

19. Continue to support articulation.

20. Recognize that the A.A. is the transfer degree, not the A.S.

21. Work with the Board of Regents to assure that the universities provide accurate and complete data to generate the level I data displays.

22. Work with the Board of Regents to assure that the universities understand and actively participate in level II review articulation meetings.

23. Extra money is needed for instructional computers and software.

24. Promote honors programs.

25. Develop a value added assessment system, perhaps by relating entry level testing and the CLAST.

26. When community college students enroll in university courses overseas, the FTE should accrue to the community college.

27. Extra funds are needed to meet the needs of health care programs.

28. Prerequisites for upper division programs should be reduced.

29. More community college courses should be allowed for teacher certification extension.

30. Provide funds to pay for follow-up evaluation.

31. Problems exist with transferability of courses, limited access programs, and foreign language requirements.

32. More and more ADN graduates are entering and completing BSN programs.

33. Money is needed to purchase up-to-date instructional equipment.

34. There needs to be constant policing to see that the provisions of the Articulation Agreement are carried out.

35. Provide scholarships for nursing students, and provide funding for nursing instructors.

36. The calculus course is a confused mixture nationally.

37. Minority access to higher education is a serious problem.

38. The situation surrounding the associate in applied science needs to be clarified.

39. There is need to evaluate the mathematics coverage of the CLAST.

40. Issues surrounding the standards of the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business and their application need to be dealt with.

41. Extra money is needed for instructional equipment for studio art, and for studio facilities.

42. Outstanding artists and art programs in community colleges need to be recognized.

43. The role of physical education in general education and in lifelong learning needs to be clarified.

44. Promote faculty exchange programs, which includes the provision of funds.

45. The facilities for theatre programs need to be improved.

46. The Articulation Agreement should be extended to private colleges and universities.

47. Separate agreements between institutions should be collected and shared with all institutions to provide ideas/models.

48. Promote international education programs.

49. Funds are needed to provide in-service training and supervision for part-time faculty.

50. Library automation will benefit the state.

51. The concept of articulation should be extended to academic advising and to financial aid.

52. An electronic student-based record system will benefit the state.

53. Information of how the CLAST essay is scored should be distributed widely, even to the general public.

54. The SBCC might find various ways to encourage the universities to develop graduate program tracks in the disciplines that are oriented toward community college teacher training.

55. Students and the public should be encouraged to reflect on the value of education.

56. Might full-time/part-time faculty ratio guidelines be beneficial?

57. The emphasis on partnerships with business and industry concentrates on economic development and training. Might some of that concentration be redirected to bring the humanities into the business community?

1988-89

1. A permanent group to continue the Foreign Language Instruction in Florida project.

2. A common set of standards for awarding CLEP credit.

3. Statewide entrance requirements for upper division programs.

4. SUS collaboration with SCCS to develop career ladder systems for public employees.

5. SUS agreement on a list of courses that will not be accepted in transfer.

6. Uniform SUS foreign language requirements.

7. Universities should be prohibited from testing community college transfers to validate course work completed while not testing their native students for the same purpose.

8. Encourage the Board of Regents to promote joint ventures between universities and community colleges to serve adults in nontraditional programs.

9. Encourage universities to offer courses on community college campuses.

10. More counselors/advisors are needed.

11. Community college math faculties should meet in conference annually.

12. A common calendar is needed.

13. There is the impression that sometimes courses with the same prefix and number are not accepted in transfer.

14. Clarification of appropriate courses for education majors in community colleges.

15. More conscious support of liberal arts education.

16. Resolve the MAT 1033 issue.

17. Enrollment in science and science-related courses needs to be encouraged.

18. Establish a statewide honors committee.

19. Uniform degree requirements in education.

20. SCCS/SUS uniform general education core.

21. A central waste disposal site for SCCS/SUS.

22. New SUS foreign language requirements require more categorical funding help than already provided.

23. The issue with the AACSB over the transfer of business course credit.

24. General education science should require a laboratory course.

25. There is an over reliance on part-time faculty.

26. The Course Numbering System office needs to intensify its work to ensure consistency in its designations.

27. Limited access upper division programs should be regulated.

APPENDIX EIGHT

A. A. Degree Graduates in SUS Upper Division
By Ethnic Group and Gender

AA GRADUATES IN SUS
1988-89

PAGE NO.
DATE PREPARED 04/20/90

DISCIPLINE GROUPINGS	WHITE (NON-HISPANIC)		BLACK		HISPANIC		INDIAN		ASIAN		NON-RESIDENT ALIEN		TOTAL	
	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALES	FEMALES
AG. SCIENCE AGRIBUSINESS AG. PROD.	62	55	4	7	6	3	0	1	0	0	12	2	84	68
ALLIED HEALTH	53	188	4	15	7	32	4	6	0	0	1	5	69	246
ARCHITECTURE & ENVIRON. DESIGN	138	133	9	4	17	24	3	5	0	0	3	3	170	169
BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT	3944	3834	145	251	514	602	80	112	1	5	87	79	4,771	4,883
COMMUNICATION & COM. TECH.	652	1039	23	68	55	87	5	10	0	2	4	7	739	1,213
COMPUTER & INFO. SCIENCE	544	273	41	51	140	143	32	25	1	1	28	22	786	515
EDUCATION	813	3679	35	131	47	234	7	22	0	6	3	8	905	4,080
ENG. & ENG. RELATED TECH.	1835	315	113	18	368	52	162	26	5	1	120	17	2,603	429
FOREIGN LANG. & AREA & ETHNIC STUD.	31	45	5	2	12	39	0	1	0	0	3	5	51	92
HEALTH SCI.	101	518	7	87	16	56	6	16	0	1	0	10	130	688
HOME EC.	22	185	0	10	1	30	0	3	0	0	2	3	25	231
LAW	24	96	0	10	4	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	29	107
LETTERS	203	415	3	17	15	36	0	2	0	1	1	3	222	474
LIB/GEN STUD & MULTI/ INTERDISCIPLINARY STUD.	210	308	9	13	25	33	2	4	0	2	5	0	251	360
LIBRARY & ARCHIVAL SCI.	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
LIFE SCIENCES	282	297	14	29	42	49	15	11	2	1	15	8	370	395
MATHEMATICS	76	85	7	4	4	11	3	2	0	0	1	3	91	105
PARKS & REC. MANAGEMENT	17	25	0	0	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	19	28
PHILOSOPHY, REL., & THEO.	31	15	3	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	17

AA GRADUATES IN SUS
1988-89

PAGE NO.
DATE PREPARED 04/20/90

DISCIPLINE GROUPINGS	WHITE (NON-HISPANIC)		BLACK		HISPANIC		INDIAN		ASIAN		NON-RESIDENT ALIEN		TOTAL	
	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALES	FEMALES
PHYSICAL SCI.	163	84	8	13	34	20	11	5	1	1	6	3	223	126
PSYCHOLOGY	310	876	10	41	57	188	2	9	2	1	5	8	386	1,123
PUB. AFFAIRS & PROTECTIVE SERVICES	541	471	52	110	73	61	4	3	1	1	1	1	672	647
RENEW. NAT. RESOURCES (FORESTRY)	26	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	26	10
SOCIAL SCI.	1172	786	51	84	151	104	10	14	2	2	9	9	1,395	999
VISUAL & PERFORM. ARTS	255	363	12	17	21	37	6	4	0	1	1	5	295	427
UNCLASSIFIED	36	30	1	3	0	3	0	3	0	0	2	0	39	39
TOTALS	11,541	14,125	556	985	1,613	1,848	352	287	16	26	309	201	14.387	17,472

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

AA GRADUATES IN SUS
1987-88

DISCIPLINE GROUPINGS	WHITE (NON-HISPANIC)		BLACK		HISPANIC		INDIAN		ASIAN		NON-RESIDENT ALIEN		TOTAL	
	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALES	FEMALES
AG. SCIENCE AGRIBUSINESS AG. PROD.	72	53	2	4	6	2	0	1	0	0	11	2	91	62
ALLIED HEALTH	49	183	3	10	7	33	3	2	0	0	2	4	64	232
ARCHITECTURE & ENVIRON. DESIGN	147	120	11	5	23	14	2	2	0	0	4	3	187	144
BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT	3826	3753	137	263	522	621	60	89	1	7	110	80	4,656	4,803
COMMUNICATION & COM. TECH.	615	992	18	86	59	70	3	9	0	2	7	7	702	1,166
COMPUTER & INFO. SCIENCE	605	310	43	59	151	166	42	23	0	1	41	19	882	578
EDUCATION	660	3226	31	124	43	203	5	18	1	7	3	8	743	3,586
ENG. & ENG. RELATED TECH.	1790	352	107	20	389	62	132	29	3	1	145	19	2,566	463
FOREIGN LANG. & AREA & ETHNIC STUD.	20	54	2	2	13	38	0	2	0	0	2	2	37	98
HEALTH SCI.	88	549	14	91	14	64	4	16	0	1	1	10	121	731
HOME EC.	15	198	1	13	2	37	0	2	0	0	1	2	19	252
LAW	16	91	0	8	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	18	100
LETTERS	168	390	5	24	15	28	1	3	0	0	0	3	189	448
LIB/GEN STUD & MULTI/ INTERDISCI- PLINARY STUD.	173	250	7	13	23	38	1	4	0	6	5	2	209	313
LIBRARY & ARCHIVAL SCI.	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
LIFE SCIENCES	296	282	14	20	38	43	9	11	0	2	11	12	368	370
MATHEMATICS	84	83	7	9	5	11	4	3	0	0	2	3	102	109
PARKS & REC. MANAGEMENT	18	28	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	33
PHILOSOPHY, REL., & THEO.	28	11	2	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	14

AA GRADUATES IN SUS
1987 88

PAGE NO.
DATE PREPARED 05/05/89

DISCIPLINE GROUPINGS	WHITE (NON-HISPANIC)		BLACK		HISPANIC		INDIAN		ASIAN		NON-RESIDENT ALIEN		TOTAL	
	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALES	FEMALES
PHYSICAL SCI.	163	88	13	7	33	23	15	7	1	1	5	7	230	133
PSYCHOLOGY	323	760	14	62	45	195	3	11	1	1	3	10	389	1,029
PUB. AFFAIRS & PROTECTIVE SERVICES	467	417	55	113	68	63	6	3	2	1	3	2	601	599
RENEW. NAT RESOURCES (FORESTRY)	23	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	8
SOCIAL SCI.	1076	765	52	96	112	93	8	14	0	2	18	11	1,266	981
VISUAL & PERFORM. ARTS	248	352	11	13	22	35	3	3	0	1	2	3	286	407
UNCLASSIFIED	34	30	0	3	0	1	2	2	0	0	1	0	37	36
TOTALS	11,004	13,326	549	1,025	1,598	1,848	303	255	9	33	377	209	13,840	16,696

AA GRADUATES IN SUS
1986-87

DATE PREPARED 05/17/90

DISCIPLINE GROUPINGS	WHITE (NON-HISPANIC)		BLACK		HISPANIC		INDIAN		ASIAN		NON-RESIDENT ALIEN		TOTAL	
	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALES	FEMALES
AG. SCIENCE AGRIBUSINESS AG. PROD.	84	56	2	3	2	2	0	2	0	0	9	4	97	67
ALLIED HEALTH	54	182	6	10	8	37	0	2	0	0	2	3	70	234
ARCHITECTURE & ENVIRON. DESIGN	132	117	12	5	26	14	2	2	0	1	8	2	180	141
BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT	3606	3598	143	258	536	657	58	93	3	10	131	87	4,477	4,703
COMMUNICATION & COM. TECH.	531	906	14	81	50	58	4	5	0	4	6	6	605	1,060
COMPUTER & INFO. SCIENCE	633	305	35	50	172	185	34	20	1	0	32	20	907	580
EDUCATION	545	2547	28	117	35	180	3	10	1	6	4	6	616	2,866
ENG. & ENG. RELATED TECH.	1801	336	89	29	396	70	137	29	3	1	172	23	2,598	488
FOREIGN LANG. & AREA & ETHNIC STUD.	20	66	1	3	10	33	0	2	0	0	0	3	31	107
HEALTH SCI.	84	524	16	83	20	58	5	17	0	0	1	11	126	693
HOME EC.	16	212	3	19	2	40	0	0	0	0	1	6	22	277
LAW	17	90	1	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	97
LETTERS	146	323	5	22	11	24	1	2	0	0	0	4	163	375
LIB/GEN STUD & MULTI/ INTERDISCIPLINARY STUD.	162	256	14	20	25	36	4	3	0	1	5	4	210	320
LIBRARY & ARCHIVAL SCI.	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
LIFE SCIENCES	308	256	22	31	41	42	11	4	0	2	9	15	391	350
MATHEMATICS	92	106	11	9	13	9	3	1	0	0	7	7	126	132
PARKS & REC. MANAGEMENT	18	26	2	0	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	32
PHILOSOPHY, REL., & THEO.	26	12	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	15

AA GRADUATES IN SUS
1986-87

DATE PREPARED 05/17/90

DISCIPLINE GROUPINGS	WHITE (NON-HISPANIC)		BLACK		HISPANIC		INDIAN		ASIAN		NON-RESIDENT ALIEN		TOTAL	
	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALES	FEMALES
PHYSICAL SCI.	168	92	10	10	39	25	11	7	1	0	11	13	240	147
PSYCHOLOGY	295	729	10	49	42	173	3	10	1	0	3	10	354	971
PUB. AFFAIRS & PROTECTIVE SERVICES	478	382	53	114	56	50	5	0	0	1	3	1	595	548
RENEW. NAT. RESOURCES (FORESTRY)	27	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	8
SOCIAL SCI.	940	641	52	100	96	79	8	7	0	2	15	10	1,111	839
VISUAL & PERFORM. ARTS	221	328	12	10	20	36	2	2	0	2	2	4	257	382
UNCLASSIFIED	36	48	2	7	4	4	0	3	0	0	2	0	44	62
TOTALS	10,440	12,147	543	1,038	1,613	1,821	281	221	10	30	423	239	13,320	15,496

APPENDIX NINE

A. A. Degree Program Innovations

1. Conducted a three-credit course in simulated archeological research. Archeologists from over the state were brought in as instructors.

2. Conducted a three-credit course covering major science topics. Twelve visiting scientists from government and industry served as instructors. Used a laboratory approach in a four-week intensive institute.

3. Developed a computer graphics course to teach desktop publishing and graphic art with a microcomputer.

4. Professional performers are brought to campus to perform the works of writers for students as part of the regular classes.

5. Use the French in Action multimedia, four-semester French language instruction package.

6. The Pep Center offers courses by correspondence; by a three-course interdisciplinary block; by individualized, self-paced packages; and by the Quanta program of three-course interactive blocks.

7. A course in great human questions focusing on issues facing the individual and society and using many periods and cultures as background. The course is team taught, using multiple perspectives, guest lecturers, media presentations, and intensive writing.

8. Established a Center for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning.

9. Apply the Learning to Learn System.

10. Added a speech course to the degree requirements.

11. Tandem weekend courses -- any of six courses taught Friday night, all day Saturday, and all day Sunday for two consecutive weekends.

12. Computers are used in composition courses.

13. Exit essays required in composition courses.

14. Provide a math lab for testing and practice.

15. Provide students with a computer based analytic orientation through the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

16. Foreign language instruction through video programs.

17. Provide dramatic presentations for school children.

18. Developed a nature trail.

19. CLAST across the curriculum conference.

20. Annual sophomore honors trip to New York theatre.

21. Annual children's theater workshop.

22. Development of instructional computer strategies for use across the curriculum.

23. The M-DCC Teaching/Learning Project.

24. Established a wellness center.

25. Placed an oral communication component in the communication requirement in the general education core.

26. Added a three-credit wellness course to the general education curriculum.

27. Redesigned humanities course into Technology and the Humanities for the 21st Century.

28. Designing a new general education core to include a course covering learning theory, history of ideas, learning styles, and academic survival skills; skills emphasis courses in English, speech, and math; core knowledge courses in humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, and ethics; enrichment courses in humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences; a capstone course; and personal fitness.

29. Computer assisted instruction in science.

30. Writing across the curriculum.

31. Developed Student Success, a course covering time management, test taking, study skills, questioning, library use, and personal issues.

TABLE 37

Supplemental Appropriations for Libraries

	1989-90	1988-89		1987-88			1986-87	1985-86	1984-85
	Materials	Automation	Materials	Automation	Books	Materials	Books	Resources	Books*
BreCC	$ 296,955	$	$ 250,953	$ 35,750	$ 91,819	$	$ 46,984	Proviso	$ 45,968
BroCC	396,935		298,878	53,000	121,471		66,762	language	65,118
CFCC	97,529		77,535		27,990		23,231	said this	16,247
CJC	49,952	17,250	34,967		13,561		7,364	amount of	7,891
DBCC	266,462	24,750	214,798		85,927		39,780	the CCPF	39,088
ECC	125,838		95,810	21,250	36,771		15,007	was to be	15,970
FCCJ	540,203		391,371	69,000	160,428		123,009	used for	82,163
FKCC	28,730	13,750	23,304		8,806	192,199	11,792	library	7,208
GCCC	101,245	22,500	73,537		29,077		16,618	resources	14,241
HCC	283,279	28,750	193,201		71,778		60,455	and for	40,617
IRCC	207,815	27,750	168,006		63,944		21,279	college and	26,742
LCCC	71,327	14,000	55,081		21,178	56,006	15,411	voc. prep	14,163
L-SCC	34,859		27,384		10,519		9,138	No amount	7,502
MCC	149,895		110,807	14,500	41,832		18,409	per college	19,529
M-DCC	1,054,820		811,710	104,499	320,550		187,340	was given.	174,711
NFJC	32,982		27,504		10,033	23,366	6,799		5,336
O-WCC	96,074	21,000	68,837		27,607		15,067		13,994
PBCC	253,591		193,483	36,500	75,753		46,004		36,191
P-HCC	82,436	17,000	56,782		20,795		8,396		10,963
PJC	297,759	22,000	226,998	31,000	91,806		62,357		49,558
PCC	106,110		76,009		29,601		16,220		17,104
SFeCC	241,754		179,067		67,867		30,962		36,417
SCC	237,387		186,002	19,750	68,327		26,693		28,725
SoFCC	80,904	16,250	62,258		20,399		7,186		7,024
SJRCC	50,718	22,750	33,815		11,784		5,630		6,749
SPJC	349,090	63,000	262,180		106,517		62,851		56,382
TCC	153,840		109,717		39,890		16,952		16,272
VCC	311,511		224,886	21,750	84,470		32,304		39,226
Total	6,000,000	310,750	4,535,240	406,999	1,760,500	271,631	1,000,000	3,000,000	899,999

*For books and instructional equipment.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

DIRECT COST OF SUPPORT PROGRAMS BY COLLEGE
1988-1989
4.1000 LEARNING RESOURCE - COST PER FTE

CCMIS 308
02/09/90
09:24 AM

		- - - - - PERSONNEL COSTS	- - - -				
COLLEGE	F.T.E	EXEC, ADMIN, MANAGERIAL	NON-INSTRUCT. PROFESSIONAL	SUPPORT STAFF	SUPPLIES SERVICES	EQUIPMENT DEPRECIATION	TOTAL
INDIAN RIVER	6,313.7		31.86	15.89	10.03	11.04	68.82
SOUTH FLORIDA	2,405.3	19.68	26.16	16.22	8.78	16.87	87.70
SEMINOLE	6,436.7	11.38	32.17	43.09	17.63	15.31	119.59
SANTA FE	6,642.1	10.07	57.26	42.78	13.21	15.06	138.37
VALENCIA	8,079.4		48.00	51.44	16.89	22.77	139.11
NORTH FLORIDA	933.4		110.82		13.56	24.16	148.54
HILLSBOROUGH	7,572.4	5.00	46.06	74.53	11.83	14.98	152.40
PENSACOLA	7,982.1	22.11	42.52	64.20	20.84	8.47	158.15
CENTRAL FLORIDA	2,997.5	16.59	30.86	76.85	15.39	20.31	159.99
ST. JOHNS RIVER	1,336.4	35.16	44.81	53.22	24.71	9.27	167.17
PASCO-HERNANDO	2,224.2	19.51	26.38	90.04	22.54	15.30	173.77
CHIPOLA	1,453.2	40.99	62.56	41.76	23.66	4.87	173.83
LAKE CITY	1,897.9	8.86	27.83	76.64	43.21	22.61	179.15
TALLAHASSEE	4,107.7	16.16	51.01	56.73	26.23	30.15	180.28
DAYTONA BEACH	7,545.0	17.36	58.34	75.99	17.01	12.08	180.78
MANATEE	3,980.3	21.12	56.12	65.21	23.16	15.64	181.25
FLA CC AT JAX	14,998.1	11.98	44.67	75.08	23.22	35.43	190.40
BROWARD	10,823.1	21.04	56.71	99.72	16.75	12.49	206.70
PALM BEACH	7,028.9	21.36	38.56	103.80	34.23	25.43	223.39
OKALOOSA-WALTON	2,766.4	17.84	64.47	70.28	19.80	51.15	223.62
BREVARD	8,509.2		117.29	48.21	46.19	12.80	224.48
GULF COAST	2,671.3	23.38	79.38	61.38	34.69	30.61	229.45
EDISON	3,341.1	45.45	18.51	134.83	22.53	13.61	234.93
MIAMI-DADE	28,307.4	11.96	87.48	101.45	21.03	31.14	253.05
ST. PETERSBURG	9,478.5	30.99	70.52	103.14	17.04	36.76	258.45
POLK	2,823.3	17.07	76.33	122.65	35.05	28.14	279.23
LAKE-SUMTER	952.7		93.07	125.87	57.12	47.38	323.43
FLORIDA KEYS	776.6	57.14	54.37	117.30	38.72	64.79	332.32
TOTAL WGTED AVG	164,383.9	14.88	59.34	76.21	21.84	22.87	195.14

SOURCES: FAFVOCS489 12/01/89 CA289 02/09/90

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

DIRECT COST SUMMARY REPORT FROM CA-2 AND CA-3

UNIT COSTS (1988-1989)

ALL COLLEGES

CCMIS 306
02/09/90
08:49 AM

PROGRAM.	ADVAN + PROF COST/FTE	PCT	VOCATIONAL COST/FTE	PCT	DEVELOPMENTAL COST/FTE	PCT	C. I. S. COST/FTE	PCT	*TOTAL INSTR* COST/FTE	PCT	COMMUNITY SER COST/FTE	PCT
PERSONNEL COSTS.												
INSTRUCTIONAL	1465.66	78	1738.61	66	896.78	69	926.00	40	1445.45	72	0.00	0
ADMINISTRATIVE	114.17	6	196.02	7	110.74	9	351.59	15	140.86	7	1.26	3
OTHER PROF.	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	8.39	22
SUPPORT	144.76	8	267.83	10	168.30	13	403.93	17	189.08	9	10.61	28
TOTAL PERS. COST	1724.59	92	2202.45	83	1175.82	91	1681.53	72	1775.40	88	20.27	53
SUPPLIES + SERV.	122.88	7	330.25	13	106.02	8	611.69	26	188.10	9	15.53	40
EQUIP. DEPRECIA.	29.51	2	106.27	4	11.28	1	29.60	1	50.00	2	2.67	7
*** TOTAL COSTS	1876.98	100	2638.98	100	1293.13	100	2322.81	100	2013.49	100	38.47	100
EQUIP. EXPEND.	76.14	0	169.77	0	32.14	0	97.90	0	97.50	0	1.85	0
FEDERAL FUNDS	28.47	0	123.74	0	82.49	0	74.38	0	67.74	0	5.82	0

PROGRAM.	ACADEMIC SUPP COST/FTE	PCT	STUDENT SERV COST/FTE	PCT	INSTITUTIONAL COST/FTE	PCT	PLANT OPER. COST/FTE	PCT	*TOTAL SUPPORT* COST/FTE	PCT	**GRAND TOTAL** COST/FTE	PCT
PERSONNEL COSTS.												
INSTRUCTIONAL	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	1445.45	35
ADMINISTRATIVE	59.19	15	46.89	10	119.08	17	7.62	2	234.04	11	374.90	9
OTHER PROF.	113.34	29	153.91	32	110.88	16	13.04	3	399.56	19	399.56	10
SUPPORT	120.67	31	210.89	44	232.80	33	238.72	51	813.69	39	1002.77	25
TOTAL PERS. COST	293.21	76	411.69	85	462.75	67	259.38	55	1447.30	70	3222.70	79
SUPPLIES + SERV.	63.92	17	66.24	14	203.65	29	202.48	43	551.83	27	739.93	18
EQUIP. DEPRECIA	27.40	7	6.37	1	29.13	4	7.65	2	73.22	4	123.23	3
*** TOTAL COSTS	384.53	100	484.30	100	695.54	100	469.51	100	2072.35	100	4085.85	100
EQUIP. EXPEND.	39.50	0	12.07	0	37.13	0	15.22	0	105.78	0	203.27	0
FEDERAL FUNDS	11.94	0	76.45	0	2.85	0	0.58	0	97.64	0	165.38	0

IMPORTANT - ALL FTE BASED ON 40/900 HOUR EQUIVALENTS.

NOTE: RESEARCH (2.0) INCLUDED WITH INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT
WORK-STUDY (8.0) INCLUDED WITH STUDENT SERVICES
DATE LAST UPDATE - 20990

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

FULL COST SUMMARY REPORT FROM CA-3
(1988 - 1989)
ALL COLLEGES

CCMIS 310
03/30/90
09:27 AM

CODES	PROGRAMS	FTE	INSTRUCTIONAL COST/FTE	OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL COST/FTE	COLLEGE-WIDE COST/FTE	TOTAL COST/FTE
1.1101	AGRIC/NAT RES	12.3	3,299.35	2,713.01	2,072.35	8,084.71
1.1102	ARCHIT/ENVIRON	8.7	909.23		2,072.35	2,981.58
1.1104	BIOLOGY	4,693.4	1,571.24	545.53	2,072.35	4,189.12
1.1109	ENGINEERING	32.7	2,114.62	1,800.66	2,072.35	5,987.63
1.1112	HEALTH	102.5	1,759.99	820.67	2,072.35	4,653.01
1.1119	PHYS.SCIENCE	7,175.8	1,621.00	475.62	2,072.35	4,168.97
1.1100	TOTAL PHYS SCIENCES	12,025.4	1,605.31	511.39	2,072.35	4,189.05
1.1210	FINE ARTS	5,307.5	2,249.71	852.50	2,072.35	5,174.56
1.1311	FOREIGN LANG.	2,526.2	1,497.44	383.29	2,072.35	3,953.08
1.1315	LETTERS	19,638.0	1,488.06	333.52	2,072.35	3,893.93
1.1300	TOTAL LETTERS/LANG.	22,164.2	1,489.13	339.20	2,072.35	3,900.68
1.1408	EDUCATION	4,570.4	1,787.50	787.73	2,072.35	4,647.58
1.1505	BUS/MANAGEMENT	367.6	1,194.99	1,143.99	2,072.35	4,411.33
1.1607	COMPUTER SCI	248.2	1,271.84	930.27	2,072.35	4,274.46
1.1617	MATHEMATICS	14,590.7	1,292.12	305.78	2,072.35	3,670.25
1.1600	TOTAL MATH/COMP SCI	14,838.9	1,291.78	316.23	2,072.35	3,680.36
1.1703	AREA STUDIES	172.7	954.86	560.44	2,072.35	3,587.65
1.1720	PSYCHOLOGY	6,620.4	1,188.11	283.73	2,072.35	3,544.19
1.1722	SOCIAL SCIENCES	12,713.6	1,215.33	265.90	2,072.35	3,553.58
1.1700	TOTAL SOC. SCIENCES	19,506.7	1,203.79	274.56	2,072.35	3,550.70
1.1806	COMMUNICATIONS	461.2	2,069.73	594.07	2,072.35	4,736.15
1.1813	HOME ECONOMICS	98.4	2,199.16	136.93	2,072.35	4,408.44
1.1814	LAW					
1.1816	LIBRARY SCIENCE	7.4	1,023.61		2,072.35	3,095.96
1.1818	MILITARY SCIENCE	28.2	51.86	382.10	2,072.35	2,506.31
1.1821	PUBLIC AFFAIRS	47.0	664.79	5,125.32	2,072.35	7,862.46
1.1823	THEOLOGY					
1.1849	INTERDISC	3,982.7	1,386.97	378.06	2,072.35	3,837.38
1.1800	TOT. OTHER DISCS	4,624.9	1,456.27	442.13	2,072.35	3,970.75
1.1000	TOTAL A/P	83,405.6	1,465.66	411.32	2,072.35	3,949.33
1.2101	AGRICULT/TECH	411.8	1,938.76	1,548.85	2,072.35	5,559.96
1.2102	AGRICULT/VOC	249.0	1,484.92	210.36	2,072.35	3,767.63
1.2103	AGRICULT/SUPP	30.7	957.27	599.12	2,072.35	3,628.74
1.2100	TOTAL AGRICULTURE	691.5	1,731.76	1,024.71	2,072.35	4,828.82

FTE BASED ON 40/900 HOUR EQUIVALENTS.

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

DIRECT COST OF INSTRUCTION BY COLLEGE
1988-1989
1.1000 TOTAL A/P - COST PER FTE

CCMIS 308
02/09/90
08:55 AM

COLLEGE	F.T.E.	- - - - - PERSONNEL COSTS - - - - INSTRUCTIONAL	ADMINISTRATIVE	SUPPORT STAFF	SUPPLIES SERVICES	EQUIPMENT DEPRECIATION	TOTAL
PASCO-HERNANDO	1,050.1	1,031.15	205.86	99.16	22.01	3.67	1,361.85
MANATEE	2,727.4	1,192.64	106.60	90.26	82.54	23.91	1,495.94
TALLAHASSEE	3,147.0	1,415.67	52.56	69.94	61.56	10.52	1,610.27
ST. PETERSBURG	5,914.3	1,447.81	74.30	9.79	65.11	23.04	1,620.04
EDISON	2,074.8	1,197.27	163.02	160.58	97.63	28.65	1,647.15
CENTRAL FLORIDA	1,398.6	1,414.58	70.88	89.64	66.30	29.01	1,670.41
HILLSBOROUGH	4,722.2	1,298.34	129.90	195.05	86.40	14.31	1,724.01
GULF COAST	1,556.5	1,422.88	108.27	79.05	107.79	31.12	1,749.11
SANTA FE	3,668.3	1,557.71	68.69	92.48	37.98	15.57	1,772.42
BROWARD	6,383.2	1,472.91	122.55	107.94	73.66	17.52	1,794.58
BREVARD	3,660.4	1,403.83	148.73	68.44	147.01	54.18	1,822.19
SEMINOLE	2,155.6	1,364.35	98.80	238.75	97.98	41.80	1,841.68
OKALOOSA-WALTON	1,326.9	1,590.83	85.91	93.49	68.19	21.00	1,859.42
SOUTH FLORIDA	546.8	1,500.91	1.55	43.03	328.86	21.11	1,895.47
FLA CC AT JAX	4,618.8	1,649.29	139.64	46.80	47.68	20.66	1,904.06
VALENCIA	5,003.4	1,281.91	214.96	196.86	166.70	44.66	1,905.10
INDIAN RIVER	1,755.5	1,594.72	44.87	105.42	173.15	19.55	1,937.72
POLK	1,678.4	1,567.15	122.87	92.74	107.17	51.01	1,940.95
PENSACOLA	3,281.6	1,435.09	191.33	260.32	107.91	26.06	2,020.71
ST. JOHNS RIVER	857.9	1,690.74	75.48	57.70	163.75	35.23	2,022.90
MIAMI-DADE	16,307.5	1,536.95	103.20	251.44	145.30	18.28	2,055.17
PALM BEACH	4,143.8	1,407.93	81.19	161.91	345.16	74.17	2,070.37
NORTH FLORIDA	407.1	1,947.93	31.11	5.41	55.98	42.78	2,083.21
LAKE CITY	567.8	1,787.55	140.70	64.83	70.51	76.39	2,139.98
DAYTONA BEACH	2,804.4	1,581.79	49.86	212.92	261.49	80.07	2,186.13
LAKE-SUMTER	535.1	1,811.40	188.86	46.09	132.10	30.22	2,208.67
CHIPOLA	711.7	2,150.05	152.36	61.54	101.10	34.10	2,499.15
FLORIDA KEYS	400.5	1,729.93	313.65	200.28	374.77	61.31	2,679.94
TOTAL WGTED AVG	83,405.6	1,465.66	114.17	144.76	122.88	29.51	1,876.98

SOURCES: FAFVOCS489 12/01/89 CA289 02/09/90

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

PERSONNEL - POSITIONS, EXPENDITURES, AND COST
1988-1989
1.1000 TOTAL A/P

CCMIS 510
02/09/90
09:05 AM

	- - - INSTRUCTIONAL - - -			- - ADMINISTRATIVE - -			- - - SUPPORT STAFF - - -			PERSONNEL COSTS
	FTE POSI	EXPEND	/POSI	FTE POSI	EXPEND	/POSI	FTE POSI	EXPEND	/POSI	PER FTE STUDENT
PASCO-HERNANDO	42.76	1,082,812	25,323	4.83	216,175	44,757	6.75	104,128	15,426	1,336.17
MANATEE	107.83	3,252,793	30,166	5.60	290,731	51,916	11.85	246,184	20,775	1,389.49
EDISON	78.26	2,484,103	31,742	6.23	338,236	54,291	16.11	333,166	20,681	1,520.87
ST. PETERSBURG	189.06	8,562,772	45,291	7.74	439,424	56,773	1.60	57,877	36,173	1,531.89
TALLAHASSEE	90.98	4,455,126	48,968	2.48	165,410	66,698	13.89	220,111	15,847	1,538.18
SOUTH FLORIDA	26.22	820,698	31,300	0.01	850	85,027	1.01	23,527	23,294	1,545.49
CENTRAL FLORIDA	63.44	1,978,432	31,186	2.09	99,137	47,434	6.05	125,372	20,723	1,575.10
GULF COAST	65.34	2,214,708	33,895	3.34	168,522	50,456	5.26	123,048	23,393	1,610.20
BREVARD	144.80	5,138,585	35,487	19.90	544,429	27,358	11.10	250,506	22,568	1,621.00
HILLSBOROUGH	188.60	6,131,044	32,508	13.31	613,436	46,088	45.03	921,047	20,454	1,623.30
PALM BEACH	159.64	5,834,200	36,546	7.10	336,423	47,384	30.28	670,943	22,158	1,651.04
VALENCIA	202.70	6,413,910	31,642	25.90	1,075,554	41,527	49.90	984,959	19,739	1,693.73
SEMINOLE	92.18	2,940,990	31,905	3.68	212,971	57,873	29.97	514,658	17,172	1,701.90
BROWARD	242.54	9,401,895	38,764	14.83	782,262	52,749	32.53	688,995	21,180	1,703.40
SANTA FE	131.07	5,714,157	43,596	5.03	251,968	50,093	17.64	339,237	19,231	1,718.88
INDIAN RIVER	77.10	2,799,537	36,310	1.30	78,771	60,593	9.92	185,060	18,655	1,745.01
OKALOOSA-WALTON	57.14	2,110,868	36,942	2.29	113,990	49,777	6.59	124,055	18,825	1,770.23
POLK	74.14	2,630,309	35,478	4.52	206,231	45,626	7.20	155,663	21,620	1,782.77
ST. JOHNS RIVER	47.09	1,450,487	30,802	1.86	64,757	34,816	3.50	49,498	14,142	1,823.92
FLA CC AT JAX	197.30	7,617,739	38,610	13.00	644,959	49,612	12.30	216,159	17,574	1,835.73
DAYTONA BEACH	108.44	4,435,960	40,907	2.34	139,832	59,757	25.82	597,124	23,126	1,844.57
PENSACOLA	149.29	4,709,397	31,545	9.90	627,867	63,421	61.04	854,259	13,995	1,886.74
MIAMI-DADE	664.05	25,063,831	37,744	30.05	1,682,890	56,003	202.04	4,100,284	20,294	1,891.58
NORTH FLORIDA	23.31	793,002	34,020	0.06	12,665	211,090	0.28	2,204	7,870	1,984.45
LAKE CITY	28.95	1,014,972	35,059	1.44	79,891	55,480	2.30	36,809	16,004	1,993.08
LAKE-SUMTER	28.69	969,278	33,785	1.93	101,061	52,363	1.07	24,665	23,051	2,046.35
FLORIDA KEYS	29.45	692,837	23,526	3.13	125,617	40,133	4.53	80,213	17,707	2,243.86
CHIPOLA	35.21	1,530,188	43,459	3.18	108,435	34,099	2.85	43,799	15,368	2,363.95
TOTAL WGTED AVG	3,345.58	122,244,630	36,539	197.07	9,522,495	48,320	618.41	12,073,548	19,524	1,724.59

SOURCES: FAFVOCS489 12/01/89 CA289 02/09/90

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

DIRECT COST OF SUPPORT PROGRAMS BY COLLEGE
1988-1989
2.0000 TOTAL SUPPORT - COST PER FTE

CCMIS 308
02/09/90
09:25 AM

COLLEGE	F.T.E.	- - - - - PERSONNEL COSTS - - - - EXEC, ADMIN. MANAGERIAL	NON-INSTRUCT. PROFESSIONAL	SUPPORT STAFF	SUPPLIES SERVICES	EQUIPMENT DEPRECIATION	TOTAL
TALLAHASSEE	4,107.7	188.70	282.83	583.80	398.03	87.98	1,541.34
SEMINOLE	6,436.7	173.44	333.29	506.41	481.05	52.85	1,547.04
INDIAN RIVER	6,313.7	125.71	242.51	679.75	541.79	51.19	1,640.94
SOUTH FLORIDA	2,405.3	255.83	279.64	634.21	534.08	71.95	1,775.71
VALENCIA	8,079.4	141.72	259.56	840.88	479.81	66.11	1,788.08
EDISON	3,341.1	340.64	125.95	832.07	491.36	38.65	1,828.68
PASCO-HERNANDO	2,224.2	281.65	170.25	627.12	679.00	91.20	1,849.22
HILLSBOROUGH	7,572.4	225.08	372.53	706.54	548.51	68.51	1,921.17
BREVARD	8,509.2	103.02	663.12	479.49	603.20	79.29	1,928.13
SANTA FE	6,642.1	214.69	378.50	898.55	403.94	56.44	1,952.11
OKALOOSA-WALTON	2,766.4	287.94	250.58	831.86	504.65	101.11	1,976.15
ST. PETERSBURG	9,478.5	313.93	321.08	867.21	413.18	86.49	2,001.90
FLA CC AT JAX	14,998.1	227.28	272.07	957.36	483.15	73.05	2,012.90
PALM BEACH	7,028.9	288.60	377.55	948.69	337.59	90.74	2,043.18
MANATEE	3,980.3	367.55	274.56	803.89	540.21	64.16	2,050.36
ST. JOHNS RIVER	1,336.4	488.41	255.13	597.20	693.22	53.22	2,087.19
DAYTONA BEACH	7,545.0	322.67	318.15	839.89	592.20	39.19	2,112.10
CHIPOLA	1,453.2	314.21	409.47	611.68	720.45	58.31	2,114.11
PENSACOLA	7,982.1	269.37	373.56	796.30	577.68	102.88	2,119.79
CENTRAL FLORIDA	2,997.5	274.62	332.75	727.00	726.55	76.59	2,137.50
GULF COAST	2,671.3	252.87	500.65	688.64	615.35	95.25	2,152.76
BROWARD	10,823.1	262.07	258.55	938.33	693.79	48.95	2,201.70
POLK	2,823.3	354.36	289.06	1,019.34	647.25	56.48	2,366.49
MIAMI-DADE	28,307.4	159.08	712.06	887.65	596.24	84.08	2,439.11
NORTH FLORIDA	933.4	341.84	473.93	883.42	636.09	116.98	2,452.26
LAKE CITY	1,897.9	459.86	350.53	908.89	949.39	79.19	2,747.86
LAKE-SUMTER	952.7	278.56	912.61	1,262.18	852.56	136.13	3,442.05
FLORIDA KEYS	776.6	764.37	427.57	1,102.82	1,158.05	129.66	3,582.47
TOTAL WGTED AVG	164,383.9	234.04	399.56	813.69	551.83	73.22	2,072.35

SOURCES: FAFVOCS489 12/01/89 CA289 02/09/90

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

PERSONNEL - POSITIONS, EXPENDITURES, AND COST
1988-1989
2.0000 TOTAL SUPPORT

CCMIS 510
02/09/90
09:07 AM

	- - EXEC. ADMIN. MAN - - - - - INSTRUCTIONAL - - -			- OTHER PROFESSIONAL- - - ADMINISTRATIVE - -			- - - SUPPORT STAFF - - -			PERSONNEL COSTS
	FTE POSI	EXPEND	/POSI	FTE POSI	EXPEND	/POSI	FTE POSI	EXPEND	/POSI	PER FTE STUDENT
SEMINOLE	15.61	1,116,394	71,518	48.52	2,145,295	44,215	175.03	3,259,592	18,623	1,013.14
INDIAN RIVER	11.16	793,670	71,117	31.84	1,531,123	48,088	188.57	4,291,714	22,759	1,047.96
TALLAHASSEE	10.51	775,139	73,753	25.20	1,161,786	46,103	135.43	2,398,064	17,707	1,055.33
PASCO-HERNANDO	12.00	626,452	52,204	12.00	378,662	31,555	89.00	1,394,844	15,672	1,079.02
SOUTH FLORIDA	10.00	615,355	61,535	20.80	672,607	32,337	77.25	1,525,466	19,747	1,169.68
VALENCIA	18.80	1,144,984	60,903	45.40	2,097,089	46,191	328.30	6,793,791	20,694	1,242.15
BREVARD	13.00	876,649	67,435	164.20	5,642,594	34,364	222.30	4,080,089	18,354	1,245.63
EDISON	21.01	1,138,112	54,170	12.58	420,815	33,451	143.29	2,780,030	19,401	1,298.66
HILLSBOROUGH	29.65	1,704,426	57,485	80.14	2,820,979	35,201	258.38	5,350,173	20,707	1,304.15
CENTRAL FLORIDA	15.45	823,162	53,279	27.74	997,416	35,956	110.93	2,179,173	19,645	1,334.36
CHIPOLA	9.10	456,605	50,176	19.00	595,038	31,318	60.39	888,894	14,719	1,335.35
ST. JOHNS RIVER	11.10	652,708	58,803	10.00	340,958	34,096	46.00	798,099	17,350	1,340.74
OKALOOSA-WALTON	14.57	796,557	54,671	15.44	693,208	44,897	117.67	2,301,264	19,557	1,370.38
PENSACOLA	36.41	2,150,111	59,053	93.72	2,981,758	31,816	413.75	6,356,170	15,362	1,439.23
GULF COAST	15.63	675,502	43,218	37.04	1,337,386	36,107	91.47	1,839,566	20,111	1,442.16
MANATEE	24.06	1,462,959	60,805	31.41	1,092,828	34,792	157.33	3,199,705	20,338	1,445.99
FLA CC AT JAX	62.70	3,408,742	54,366	91.30	4,080,498	44,693	759.00	14,358,549	18,918	1,456.70
BROWARD	46.57	2,836,426	60,907	59.19	2,798,347	47,277	502.29	10,155,682	20,219	1,458.96
DAYTONA BEACH	35.44	2,434,566	68,695	59.29	2,400,459	40,487	335.38	6,336,983	18,895	1,480.72
SANTA FE	25.90	1,425,973	55,057	67.60	2,514,011	37,190	345.17	5,968,265	17,291	1,491.73
ST. PETERSBURG	47.30	2,975,613	62,909	69.77	3,043,382	43,620	445.81	8,219,804	18,438	1,502.22
PALM BEACH	29.51	2,028,542	68,741	74.46	2,653,795	35,641	279.27	6,668,242	23,877	1,614.84
POLK	16.92	1,000,469	59,129	22.25	816,091	36,678	159.47	2,877,911	18,047	1,662.76
NORTH FLORIDA	5.00	319,077	63,815	13.18	442,369	33,564	53.60	824,583	15,384	1,699.20
LAKE CITY	20.91	872,759	41,739	35.14	665,278	18,932	94.31	1,724,974	18,290	1,719.27
MIAMI-DADE	58.09	4,503,089	77,519	530.34	20,156,615	38,007	1,536.16	25,127,195	16,357	1,758.79
FLORIDA KEYS	11.17	593,607	53,143	10.18	332,050	32,618	46.55	856,451	18,399	2,294.76
LAKE-SUMTER	3.92	265,385	67,700	19.33	869,447	44,979	63.80	1,202,477	18,848	2,453.35
TOTAL WGTED AVG	631.49	38,473,033	60,924	1,727.06	65,681,883	38,031	7,235.90	133,757,750	18,485	1,447.30

SOURCES: FAFVOCS489 12/01/89 CA289 02/09/90

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

DIRECT COST OF SUPPORT PROGRAMS BY COLLEGE
1987-1988
4.1000 LEARNING RESOURCE - COST PER FTE

CCMIS 308
01/24/89
09.16 AM

COLLEGE	F.T.E.	- - - - - PERSONNEL COSTS EXEC, ADMIN, MANAGERIAL	NON-INSTRUCT. PROFESSIONAL	SUPPORT STAFF	SUPPLIES SERVICES	EQUIPMENT DEPRECIATION	TOTAL
INDIAN RIVER	5,839.1		32.33	15.87	6.55	12.26	67.02
SOUTH FLORIDA	1,967.8	21.46		35.59	8.68	20.51	86.23
SEMINOLE	6,054.4	10.97	30.95	39.23	17.86	17.15	116.16
VALENCIA	7,363.4		46.04	46.77	15.11	23.67	131.59
ST. JOHNS RIVER	1,127.1	36.74	33.35	48.85	16.21	6.10	141.23
LAKE CITY	2,059.5	19.51	20.06	59.99	25.04	18.94	143.54
NORTH FLORIDA	1,202.2		79.52	44.69	9.02	15.79	149.02
SANTA FE	6,072.3	14.30	63.55	41.81	15.82	15.24	150.72
DAYTONA BEACH	7,333.0	9.97	53.37	69.73	16.48	9.75	159.29
HILLSBOROUGH	6,692.8	8.49	44.67	79.81	11.38	16.28	160.60
MANATEE	3,734.9	20.80	55.61	48.36	20.05	16.89	161.71
PENSACOLA	7,661.8	19.99	40.74	71.76	23.87	8.11	164.48
TALLAHASSEE	3,595.3	16.92	45.20	53.04	19.37	31.49	166.02
CHIPOLA	1,160.7	33.14	63.98	48.04	19.87	6.27	171.30
CENTRAL FLORIDA	2,657.0	18.32	43.81	67.96	23.34	24.09	177.50
BROWARD	10,026.4	16.01	44.50	103.46	13.87	15.48	191.32
PASCO HERNANDO	1,889.8	20.54	37.83	85.15	26.70	17.44	187.66
BREVARD	8,220.3	13.25	91.54	35.00	39.45	23.29	202.52
FLA CC AT JAX	12,859.4	11.48	51.61	83.84	24.20	38.17	209.30
GULF COAST	2,486.7	23.87	71.00	62.38	25.72	26.71	209.70
EDISON	3,185.5	31.77	55.62	93.16	22.80	13.17	216.48
OKALOOSA-WALTON	2,285.4	19.44	65.01	86.01	23.80	33.62	227.87
PALM BEACH	6,543.6	27.53	43.08	103.22	38.54	24.95	237.27
FLORIDA KEYS	780.3	34.36	38.13	106.82	33.09	32.44	244.84
MIAMI-DADE	26,682.9	11.96	81.17	100.79	24.24	30.53	248.70
ST. PETERSBURG	8,874.1	15.78	75.17	96.84	22.80	39.03	249.62
LAKE-SUMTER	930.9		64.27	132.23	38.40	35.93	270.83
POLK	2,517.6	23.25	79.59	126.82	36.48	53.80	319.94
TOTAL WGTED AVG	151,809.0	14.80	57.17	75.20	21.95	23.66	192.27

SOURCES: FAFVOCS488 01/19/89 CA288 01/23/89

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

DIRECT COST SUMMARY REPORT FROM CA-2 AND CA 3

UNIT COSTS (1987-1988)

CCMIS 306
01/24/89
08:56 AM

ALL COLLEGES

PROGRAM.	ADVAN + PROF		VOCATIONAL		DEVELOPMENTAL		C. I. S.		*TOTAL INSTR*		COMMUNITY SER	
	COST/FTE	PCT	COST/FTE	PCT	COST/FTE	PCT	COST/FTE	PCT	COST/FTE	PCT	COST/FTE	PCT
PERSONNEL COSTS.												
INSTRUCTIONAL	1434.54	80	1677.80	67	1504.56	71	229.97	45	1413.56	73	0.00	0
ADMINISTRATIVE	112.03	6	191.45	8	159.47	8	86.34	17	136.86	7	2.30	6
OTHER PROF.	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	7.17	19
SUPPORT	127.38	7	238.34	10	268.84	13	85.39	17	170.15	9	11.71	30
TOTAL PERS. COST	1673.94	93	2107.58	85	1932.88	91	401.70	78	1720.58	89	21.18	55
SUPPLIES + SERV.	95.96	5	280.97	11	161.61	8	109.69	21	158.22	8	14.80	38
EQUIP. DEPRECIA.	25.49	1	99.48	4	18.86	1	5.36	1	46.30	2	2.61	7
*** TOTAL COSTS	1795.40	100	2488.03	100	2113.36	100	516.74	100	1925.09	100	38.60	100
EQUIP. EXPEND.	41.85	0	124.07	0	39.46	0	11.62	0	64.65	0	3.68	0
FEDERAL FUNDS	15.07	0	109.83	0	123.52	0	34.70	0	56.06	0	8.04	0

PROGRAM.	ACADEMIC SUPP		STUDENT SERV		INSTITUTIONAL		PLANT OPER.		*TOTAL SUPPORT*		**GRAND TOTAL**	
	COST/FTE	PCT	COST/FTE	PCT	COST/FTE	PCT	COST/FTE	PCT	COST/FTE	PCT	COST/FTE	PCT
PERSONNEL COSTS.												
INSTRUCTIONAL	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	1413.56	35
ADMINISTRATIVE	56.57	15	50.99	10	118.78	17	7.55	2	236.20	11	373.06	9
OTHER PROF.	108.36	29	149.33	30	101.90	15	12.22	3	378.99	18	378.99	10
SUPPORT	120.10	32	209.00,	42	231.58	34	233.70	50	806.08	39	976.23	24
TOTAL PERS. COST	285.02	76	409.32	83	452.26	66	253.48	54	1421.26	69	3141.84	79
SUPPLIES + SERV.	64.42	17	79.16	16	201.99	30	210.41	45	570.78	28	728.99	18
EQUIP. DEPRECIA.	27.81	7	5.87	1	27.15	4	6.95	1	70.39	3	116.69	3
*** TOTAL COSTS	377.25	100	494.34	100	681.40	100	470.84	100	2062.43	100	3987.52	100
EQUIP. EXPEND.	35.61	0	9.23	0	32.38	0	9.51	0	90.40	0	155.05	0
FEDERAL FUNDS	12.59	0	73.89	0	5.22	0	0.17	0	99.91	0	155.97	0

IMPORTANT - ALL FTE BASED ON 40/900 HOUR EQUIVALENTS.

NOTE: RESEARCH (2.0) INCLUDED WITH INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT
WORK STUDY (8.0) INCLUDED WITH STUDENT SERVICES
DATE LAST UPDATE - 12389

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

FULL COST SUMMARY REPORT FROM CA-3
(1987 - 1988)
ALL COLLEGES

CCMIS 310
01/24/89
08:58 AM

CODES	PROGRAMS	FTE	INSTRUCTIONAL COST/FTE	OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL COST/FTE	COLLEGE WIDE COST/FTE	TOTAL COST/FTE
1.1101	AGRIC/NAT RES.	12.6	3,396.59	2,383.33	2,062.43	7,842.35
1.1102	ARCHIT/ENVIRON					
1.1104	BIOLOGY	4,490.6	1,531.64	493.04	2,062.43	4,087.11
1.1109	ENGINEERING	31.1	1,728.60	1,847.45	2,062.43	5,638.48
1.1112	HEALTH	116.6	1,820.09	660.02	2,062.43	4,542.54
1.1119	PHYS. SCIENCE	6,610.7	1,612.05	411.07	2,062.43	4,085.55
1.1100	TOTAL PHYS. SCIENCES	11,261.6	1,584.46	452.50	2,062.43	4,099.39
1.1210	FINE ARTS	4,887.0	2,168.48	709.77	2,062.43	4,940.68
1.1311	FOREIGN LANG.	2,165.1	1,434.13	277.10	2,062.43	3,773.66
1.1315	LETTERS	18,037.6	1,438.12	300.23	2,062.43	3,800.78
1.1300	TOTAL LETTERS/LANG.	20,202.7	1,437.70	297.75	2,062.43	3,797.88
1.1408	EDUCATION	4,106.0	1,872.07	745.53	2,062.43	4,680.03
1.1505	BUS/MANAGEMENT	548.8	1,127.65	552.17	2,062.43	3,742.25
1.1607	COMPUTER SCI.	310.5	1,253.03	338.45	2,062.43	3,653.91
1.1617	MATHEMATICS	13,449.7	1,239.19	281.28	2,062.43	3,582.90
1.1600	TOTAL MATH/COMP. SCI.	13,760.2	1,239.50	282.57	2,062.43	3,584.50
1.1703	AREA STUDIES	161.3	949.36	129.42	2,062.43	3,141.21
1.1720	PSYCHOLOGY	5,907.1	1,205.59	249.50	2,062.43	3,517.52
1.1722	SOCIAL SCIENCES	11,878.7	1,202.86	253.08	2,062.43	3,518.37
1.1700	TOTAL SOC. SCIENCES	17,947.1	1,201.48	250.79	2,062.43	3,514.70
1.1806	COMMUNICATIONS	414.0	2,117.21	448.19	2,062.43	4,627.83
1.1813	HOME ECONOMICS	106.4	1,601.31	275.52	2,062.43	3,939.26
1.1814	LAW					
1.1816	LIBRARY SCIENCE	9.1	1,296.93	31.69	2,062.43	3,391.05
1.1818	MILITARY SCIENCE	34.3	73.29	256.71	2,062.43	2,392.43
1.1821	PUBLIC AFFAIRS	45.3	947.79	346.51	2,062.43	3,356.73
1.1823	THEOLOGY					
1.1849	INTERDISC.	3,530.6	1,340.75	328.74	2,062.43	3,731.92
1.1800	TOT. OTHER DISCS.	4,139.7	1,410.20	338.26	2,062.43	3,810.89
1.1000	TOTAL A/P	76,853.1	1,434.54	360.86	2,062.43	3,857.83
1.2101	AGRICULT/TECH	409.5	2,180.57	913.51	2,062.43	5,156.51
1.2102	AGRICULT/VOC	298.4	1,326.21	208.82	2,062.43	3,597.46
1.2108	AGRICULT/SUPP	26.3	539.02	474.44	2,062.43	3,075.89
1.2100	TOTAL AGRICULTURE	734.2	1,774.53	611.38	2,062.43	4,448.34

FTE BASED ON 40/900 HOUR EQUIVALENTS.

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

DIRECT COST OF INSTRUCTION BY COLLEGE
1987-1988
1.1000 TOTAL A/P COST PER FTE

CCMIS 308
01/24/89
00.12 AM

		- - - - - PERSONNEL	COSTS - - -				
COLLEGE	F.T.E.	INSTRUCTIONAL	ADMINISTRATIVE	SUPPORT STAFF	SUPPLIES SERVICES	EQUIPMENT DEPRECIATION	TOTAL
MANATEE	2,465.0	1,131.26	104.08	94.82	64.08	23.69	1,417.93
PASCO-HERNANDO	834.6	1,079.11	215.07	95.66	23.96	8.36	1,422.17
TALLAHASSEE	2,692.3	1,326.79	52.02	57.35	57.91	9.77	1,503.84
EDISON	1,960.0	1,137.40	159.80	160.45	82.96	30.41	1,571.03
ST. PETERSBURG	5,426.7	1,399.63	94.77	3.00	75.87	26.53	1,599.80
HILLSBOROUGH	4,530.0	1,308.76	127.15	151.23	57.10	11.36	1,655.60
INDIAN RIVER	1,735.0	1,399.03	36.88	69.13	139.43	16.57	1,661.04
CENTRAL FLORIDA	1,202.0	1,457.23	28.91	73.50	71.24	30.27	1,661.14
BROWARD	5,999.8	1,331.75	166.47	92.62	58.06	20.24	1,669.14
SANTA FE	3,325.6	1,477.87	67.85	100.95	27.29	11.90	1,685.86
GULF COAST	1,439.3	1,432.30	66.86	98.69	113.59	24.39	1,735.84
SOUTH FLORIDA	453.3	1,555.38		48.48	108.78	24.72	1,737.35
VALENCIA	4,341.8	1,224.14	218.71	186.88	111.26	29.23	1,770.23
NORTH FLORIDA	372.8	1,691.92	47.58	4.41	61.02	27.33	1,832.26
SEMINOLE	1,799.9	1,407.45	114.71	223.11	96.06	25.08	1,866.42
DAYTONA BEACH	2,706.6	1,506.27	40.68	123.57	165.10	43.86	1,879.48
FLA CC AT JAX	4,374.2	1,652.35	130.92	37.84	47.38	20.55	1,889.06
MIAMI-DADE	15,399.0	1,479.89	95.51	212.32	85.79	15.56	1,889.06
POLK	1,453.9	1,496.28	150.70	93.75	88.48	61.85	1,891.06
CAKE-SUMTER	503.7	1,697.81	76.71	28.09	79.18	19.50	1,901.28
PALM BEACH	3,833.0	1,261.83	79.00	162.49	333.39	66.89	1,903.60
OKALOOSA-WALTON	1,102.5	1,730.15	62.01	61.48	66.10	16.75	1,936.49
BREVARD	3,520.8	1,663.86	152.28	65.08	106.98	43.14	2,030.34
PENSACOLA	3,103.8	1,566.81	125.17	240.80	96.37	22.00	2,051.16
ST. JOHNS RIVER	699.8	1,696.04	120.43	66.18	189.66	32.62	2,104.92
LAKE CITY	575.7	1,961.30	28.76	127.30	93.34	68.50	2,279.20
CHIPOLA	599.1	2,182.44	177.48	61.71	123.87	32.77	2,578.28
FLORIDA KEYS	402.9	1,716.74	304.10	208.13	304.13	82.05	2,615.15
TOTAL WGTED AVG	76,853.1	1,434.54	112.08	127.38	95.96	25.49	1,795.40

SOURCES: FAFVOCS488 01/19/89 CA288 01/23/89

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

PERSONNEL - POSITIONS, EXPENDITURES, AND COST
1987-1988
1.1000 TOTAL A/P

CCMIS 510
01/24/89
09:20 AM

	- - - INSTRUCTIONAL - - -			- - ADMINISTRATIVE - -			- - SUPPORT STAFF - - -			PERSONNEL COSTS
	FTE POSI	EXPEND	/POSI	FTE POSI	EXPEND	/POSI	FTE POSI	EXPEND	/POSI	PER FTE STUDENT
MANATEE	95.69	2,788,568	29,142	5.50	256,512	46,638	12.06	233,742	19,382	1,330.15
PASCO HERNANDO	34.55	900,624	26,067	4.29	179,502	41,842	6.02	79,839	13,262	1,389.84
TALLAHASSEE	77.72	3,572,115	45,961	2.32	140,051	60,367	10.23	154,410	15,094	1,436.16
EDISON	74.23	2,229,299	30,032	6.31	313,213	49,638	16.05	314,491	19,594	1,467.65
ST. PETERSBURG	188.77	7,595,370	40,236	9.75	514,272	52,746	1.18	16,305	13,818	1,497.40
PALM BEACH	145.83	4,836,604	33,166	5.45	302,801	55,560	29.36	622,830	21,214	1,503.32
INDIAN RIVER	77.44	2,427,315	31,344	1.14	63,986	56,128	7.77	119,948	15,437	1,505.04
CENTRAL FLORIDA	60.30	1,751,594	29,048	0.80	34,744	43,430	4.50	88,343	19,632	1,559.63
HILLSBOROUGH	193.74	5,928,672	30,601	10.06	575,968	57,253	35.75	685,094	19,163	1,587.14
BROWARD	234.31	7,990,208	34,101	20.78	998,794	48,065	28.44	555,696	19,539	1,590.84
GULF COAST	62.82	2,061,511	32,816	2.01	96,238	47,880	6.04	142,046	23,518	1,597.86
SOUTH FLORIDA	27.01	705,052	26,103				1.00	21,974	21,974	1,603.85
VALENCIA	172.70	5,314,982	30,776	21.10	949,581	45,004	40.70	811,411	19,936	1,629.73
SANTA FE	120.00	4,914,803	40,957	5.20	225,635	43,391	18.70	335,729	17,953	1,646.67
DAYTONA BEACH	199.92	4,076,863	20,392	5.35	110,095	20,578	2.12	334,461	157,765	1,670.52
POLK	61.95	2,175,448	35,116	4.01	219,097	54,638	7.47	136,298	18,246	1,740.73
NORTH FLORIDA	21.06	630,749	29,950	0.04	17,737	443,434	0.15	1,644	10,957	1,743.91
SEMINOLE	79.06	2,533,263	32,042	3.79	206,468	54,477	24.22	401,584	16,581	1,745.27
MIAMI-DADE	609.09	22,788,759	37,414	28.49	1,470,766	51,624	171.87	3,269,488	19,023	1,787.71
LAKE SUMTER	27.40	855,186	31,211	0.79	38,640	48,912	0.57	14,147	24,819	1,802.61
FLA CC AT JAX	186.30	7,227,730	38,796	12.15	572,687	47,135	9.10	165,540	18,191	1,821.12
OKALOOSA-WALTON	50.29	1,907,493	37,930	1.97	68,368	34,704	4.90	67,777	13,832	1,853.64
BREVARD	153.50	5,858,115	38,164	17.40	536,150	30,813	9.90	229,131	23,145	1,880.22
ST JOHNS RIVER	40.92	1,186,886	29,005	3.51	84,278	24,011	3.20	46,312	14,473	1,882.65
PENSACOLA	143.95	4,863,071	33,783	7.32	388,516	53,076	44.01	747,403	16,983	1,932.79
LAKE CITY	33.97	1,129,118	33,239	0.89	16,560	18,607	4.52	73,289	16,214	2,117.37
FLORIDA KEYS	32.60	691,674	21,217	3.67	122,521	33,384	4.86	83,857	17,255	2,228.97
CHIPOLA	36.67	1,307,502	35,656	2.41	106,326	44,119	1.87	36,972	19,771	2,421.63
TOTAL WGTED AVG	3,241.79	110,248,575	34,009	186.50	8,609,503	46,164	506.56	9,789,760	19,326	1,673.94

SOURCES: FAFVOCS488 01/19/89 CA288 01/23/89

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

DIRECT COST OF SUPPORT PROGRAMS BY COLLEGE
1987-1988
2.0000 TOTAL SUPPORT - COST PER FTE -

CCMIS 308
01/24/89
09:17 AM

COLLEGE	F.T.E.	- - - - - PERSONNEL COSTS - - - - EXEC. ADMIN. MANAGERIAL	NON-INSTRUCT. PROFESSIONAL	SUPPORT STAFF	SUPPLIES SERVICES	EQUIPMENT DEPRECIATION	TOTAL
SEMINOLE	6,054.4	178.05	307.37	463.67	468.02	47.76	1,464.87
NORTH FLORIDA	1,202.2	246.94	276.60	629.23	479.46	59.23	1,691.46
INDIAN RIVER	5,839.1	157.94	252.27	723.15	547.34	51.42	1,732.14
EDISON	3,185.3	309.55	151.10	738.01	502.30	36.94	1,737.90
PASCO-HERNANDO	1,889.8	265.00	148.91	650.24	624.14	58.43	1,746.71
SOUTH FLORIDA	1,967.8	303.42	265.19	526.61	582.32	87.56	1,765.09
VALENCIA	7,363.4	140.40	226.81	867.86	486.52	59.17	1,780.76
BREVARD	8,220.3	215.64	505.76	462.82	528.73	75.49	1,788.45
DAYTONA BEACH	7,333.0	246.71	301.00	764.27	513.42	30.89	1,856.30
MANATEE	3,784.9	343.12	293.39	715.88	508.77	58.73	1,920.90
SANTA FE	6,072.3	220.40	347.04	865.81	449.24	56.95	1,939.45
ST. JOHNS RIVER	1,127.1	539.50	221.87	600.57	542.62	45.89	1,950.45
ST. PETERSBURG	8,874.1	210.85	395.37	870.13	399.95	87.32	1,963.63
PALM BEACH	6,543.6	322.90	342.46	884.97	343.81	86.40	1,980.53
OKALOOSA-WALTON	2,285.4	411.08	259.09	827.95	449.56	80.31	2,027.99
CENTRAL FLORIDA	2,657.0	241.62	270.41	736.57	755.44	77.51	2,081.55
PENSACOLA	7,661.8	280.06	331.66	760.82	609.84	99.73	2,082.12
HILLSBOROUGH	6,692.8	238.97	374.27	829.58	608.42	72.79	2,124.03
GULF COAST	2,486.7	291.23	435.91	708.40	616.13	87.36	2,139.02
FLA CC AT JAX	12,859.4	235.96	297.27	1,035.53	550.15	75.81	2,194.71
BROWARD	10,026.4	249.41	218.91	976.88	743.92	52.84	2,241.95
LAKE CITY	2,059.5	467.79	208.43	741.86	791.57	66.34	2,275.98
TALLAHASSEE	3,595.3	248.78	458.13	633.77	910.78	83.98	2,335.46
POLK	2,517.6	377.43	259.89	985.85	637.63	90.55	2,351.34
MIAMI DADE	26,682.9	148.01	665.63	856.79	620.80	78.50	2,369.73
CHIPOLA	1,160.7	332.36	495.80	674.03	893.71	61.92	2,457.82
LAKE SUMTER	930.9	324.77	626.26	1,282.26	713.41	120.34	3,067.04
FLORIDA KEYS	780.3	789.71	300.41	1,043.63	976.23	93.73	3,203.72
TOTAL WGTED AVG	151,804.0	236.20	378.99	806.08	570.78	70.39	2,062.43

SOURCES: FAFVOCS488 01/19/89 CA288 01/23/89

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

PERSONNEL - POSITIONS, EXPENDITURES, AND COST
1987-1988
2.0000 TOTAL SUPPORT

CCMIS 510
01/24/89
09:23 AM

	- - EXEC. ADMIN. MAN - - - - - INSTRUCTIONAL - - -			- OTHER PROFESSIONAL- - - ADMINISTRATIVE - -			- - - SUPPORT STAFF - - -			PERSONNEL COSTS
	FTE POSI	EXPEND	/POSI	FTE POSI	EXPEND	/POSI	FTE POSI	EXPEND	/POSI	PER FTE STUDENT
SEMINOLE	16.82	1,077,981	64,089	49.12	1,860,955	37,886	165.16	2,807,257	16,997	949.09
PASCO-HERNANDO	10.00	500,790	50,079	10.92	281,404	25,770	72.82	1,228,819	16,875	1,064.14
SOUTH FLORIDA	10.00	597,065	59,706	17.12	521,837	30,481	59.60	1,036,257	17,387	1,095.21
INDIAN RIVER	12.60	922,256	73,195	35.19	1,473,058	41,860	192.63	4,222,559	21,921	1,133.37
NORTH FLORIDA	5.00	296,868	59,374	11.53	332,527	28,840	55.45	756,463	13,642	1,152.77
BREVARD	36.70	1,772,642	48,301	168.10	4,157,508	24,732	303.30	3,804,483	12,544	1,184.22
EDISON	21.10	986,016	46,731	16.10	481,298	29,894	137.40	2,350,791	17,109	1,198.66
VALENCIA	17.50	1,033,818	59,075	37.80	1,670,110	44,183	442.10	6,390,366	14,455	1,235.07
CENTRAL FLORIDA	12.50	641,973	51,358	20.40	718,490	35,220	101.90	1,957,059	19,206	1,248.60
DAYTONA BEACH	27.48	1,809,120	65,834	60.83	2,207,251	36,286	324.22	5,604,373	17,286	1,311.98
TALLAHASSEE	13.77	894,448	64,956	45.99	1,647,124	35,815	136.90	2,278,611	16,644	1,340.69
MANATEE	23.73	1,281,513	54,004	35.08	1,095,786	31,237	147.53	2,673,749	18,123	1,352.39
ST. JOHNS RIVER	12.20	608,069	49,842	9.15	250,075	27,331	44.95	676,898	15,059	1,361.94
PENSACOLA	36.04	2,145,763	59,538	86.03	2,541,143	29,538	420.18	5,829,287	13,873	1,372.55
LAKE CITY	23.50	963,409	40,996	23.15	429,256	18,542	89.47	1,527,868	17,077	1,418.08
SANTA FE	25.60	1,338,353	52,279	57.10	2,107,310	36,906	325.80	5,257,465	16,137	1,433.25
GULF COAST	11.07	724,202	65,420	35.80	1,083,978	30,279	92.53	1,761,574	19,038	1,435.54
HILLSBOROUGH	29.44	1,599,359	54,326	75.81	2,504,920	33,042	289.62	5,552,221	19,171	1,442.82
BROWARD	45.68	2,500,638	54,743	51.29	2,194,929	42,794	515.40	9,794,581	19,004	1,445.20
ST. PETERSBURG	28.48	1,871,148	65,700	83.09	3,508,563	42,226	432.68	7,721,632	17,846	1,476.36
OKALOOSA-WALTON	16.50	939,474	56,938	14.88	592,129	39,794	107.51	1,892,184	17,600	1,498.12
CHIPOLA	8.06	385,774	47,863	19.72	575,474	29,182	51.36	782,347	15,233	1,502.19
PALM BEACH	31.37	2,112,931	67,355	58.73	2,240,894	38,156	266.95	5,790,901	21,693	1,550.33
FLA CC AT JAX	58.07	3,034,245	52,252	77.80	3,822,705	49,135	749.90	13,316,282	17,757	1,568.75
POLK	17.07	950,209	55,665	17.82	654,302	36,717	147.16	2,481,966	16,866	1,623.16
MIAMI-DADE	57.44	3,949,410	68,757	489.14	17,761,067	36,311	1,442.20	22,861,545	15,852	1,670.43
FLORIDA KEYS	13.40	616,212	45,986	8.03	234,408	29,192	45.97	814,344	17,715	2,133.75
LAKE-SUMTER	5.00	302,333	60,467	16.49	582,988	35,354	61.20	1,193,653	19,504	2,233.29
TOTAL WGTED AVG	626.12	35,856,017	57,267	1,632.21	57,531,489	35,248	7,221.89	122,365,645	16,944	1,421.26

SOURCES: FAFVOCS488 01/19/89 CA288 01/23/89

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

DIRECT COST OF SUPPORT PROGRAMS BY COLLEGE
1986-1987
4.1000 LEARNING RESOURCE _ COST PER FTE

		- - - - - PERSONNEL COSTS - - - -					
COLLEGE	F.T.E.	EXEC. ADMIN. MANAGERIAL	NON-INSTRUC. PROFESSIONAL	SUPPORT STAFF	SUPPLIES SERVICES	EQUIPMENT DEPRECIATION	TOTAL
INDIAN RIVER	5,421.9		32.68	16.04	5.88	13.37	67.98
SOUTH FLORIDA	1,875.3	21.67		27.94	8.85	22.70	81.16
VALENCIA	6,706.9		43.42	25.87	17.35	25.09	111.72
LAKE CITY	2,310.1	12.78	17.39	51.74	24.51	15.35	121.77
SEMINOLE	5,464.6	11.38	36.45	39.48	17.51	18.83	123.66
DAYTONA BEACH	7,347.9	9.97	22.53	81.13	14.82	5.04	133.49
SANTA FE	5,700.5	10.50	57.03	47.92	17.13	14.41	146.99
ST. JOHNS RIVER	969.0	38.73	40.37	48.65	15.38	6.55	149.69
HILLSBOROUGH	6,444.6	5.33	36.65	77.20	10.76	26.92	156.87
CHIPOLA	1,090.3	28.92	63.26	46.51	20.36	4.47	163.52
PASCO-HERNANDO	1,718.8	21.21	40.06	62.93	22.94	20.12	167.26
BROWARD	10,209.3	15.33	38.04	95.90	11.62	10.13	171.03
CENTRAL FLORIDA	2,460.3	18.84	45.12	68.22	15.44	25.46	173.09
MANATEE	3,361.1	14.36	64.06	59.56	19.69	17.48	175.15
TALLAHASSEE	3,172.3	17.94	47.35	55.35	24.04	32.94	177.62
NORTH FLORIDA	982.3		94.19	51.47	12.50	20.11	178.27
FLA CC AT JAX	12,578.2	18.84	45.12	68.22	15.44	25.46	173.09
PENSACOLA	7,485.2	18.76	38.60	69.51	25.99	36.46	189.32
PALM BEACH	6,216.6	17.83	40.91	84.51	32.34	23.85	199.44
EDISON	2,955.1	30.93	53.29	89.83	21.61	11.75	207.41
GULF COAST	2,290.4	23.53	70.70	63.48	30.17	24.65	212.53
BREVARD	7,556.8	13.43	96.45	34.78	48.16	21.58	214.40
POLK	2,374.4	20.62	44.59	107.15	27.32	20.19	219.86
MIAMI-DADE	26,028.9	8.80	74.17	99.05	24.81	28.20	235.04
OKALOOSA-WALTON	2,119.3	19.64	71.63	86.14	25.86	32.10	235.36
ST. PETERSBURG	8,721.0	14.23	74.40	89.58	17.25	42.57	238.04
FLORIDA KEYS	704.6	55.16	36.73	97.56	22.09	31.75	243.28
LAKE-SUMTER	898.1		112.60	120.84	36.26	33.60	303.30
TOTAL WGTED AVG	145,163.8	13.21	52.35	71.91	21.43	24.14	193.04

(SOURCES: FAFVOCS487 01/26/88 CA287 02/03/88)

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

DIRECT COST SUMMARY REPORT FROM CA-2 AND CA-3

UNIT COSTS (1986-1987)

CCMIS 306
02/11/88
09:13 AM

ALL COLLEGES

PROGRAM.	ADVAN + PROF		VOCATIONAL		DEVELOPMENTAL		C. I. S.		*TOTAL INSTR*		COMMUNITY SER	
	COST/FTE	PCT	COST/FTE	PCT	COST/FTE	PCT	COST/FTE	PCT	COST/FTE	PCT	COST/FTE	PCT
PERSONNEL COSTS.												
INSTRUCTIONAL	1392.97	80	1543.19	68	857.20	75	721.29	48	1337.95	74	0.00	0
ADMINISTRATIVE	97.52	6	167.49	7	75.06	7	191.81	13	120.28	7	1.20	3
OTHER PROF.	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	7.06	19
SUPPORT	126.37	7	221.50	10	128.16	11	289.18	19	163.43	9	12.05	32
TOTAL PERS. COST	1616.86	93	1932.18	85	1060.42	93	1202.28	80	1621.66	89	20.31	54
SUPPLIES + SERV.	98.29	6	256.45	11	71.68	6	285.74	19	152.58	8	14.60	38
EQUIP. DEPRECIA.	25.50	1	92.53	4	8.77	1	10.44	1	44.50	2	3.03	8
*** TOTAL COSTS	1740.85	100	2281.15	100	1140.87	100	1498.46	100	1818.74	100	37.94	100
EQUIP. EXPEND.	43.52	0	125.65	0	20.82	0	37.00	0	66.86	0	3.49	0
FEDERAL FUNDS	17.92	0	122.11	0	73.97	0	22.75	0	60.94	0	5.47	0

PROGRAM.	ACADEMIC SUPP		STUDENT SERV		INSTITUTIONAL		PLANT OPER.		*TOTAL SUPPORT*		**GRAND TOTAL**	
	COST/FTE	PCT	COST/FTE	PCT	COST/FTE	PCT	COST/FTE	PCT	COST/FTE	PCT	COST/FTE	PCT
PERSONNEL COSTS.												
INSTRUCTIONAL	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	1337.95	36
ADMINISTRATIVE	55.59	16	44.88	10	108.21	17	7.24	2	217.12	11	337.40	9
OTHER PROF.	97.45	27	140.24	30	86.25	14	10.68	2	341.68	18	341.68	9
SUPPORT	116.90	33	208.55	45	215.64	34	222.38	51	775.52	40	938.94	25
TOTAL PERS. COST	269.94	76	393.67	85	410.10	64	240.30	55	1334.32	69	2955.08	79
SUPPLIES + SERV.	57.48	16	65.81	14	203.95	32	192.39	44	534.23	28	686.81	18
EQUIP. DEPRECIA.	28.40	8	5.77	1	23.45	4	6.67	2	67.33	3	111.82	3
*** TOTAL COSTS	355.82	100	465.25	100	637.50	100	439.36	100	1935.87	100	3754.61	100
EQUIP. EXPEND.	34.59	0	10.72	0	34.13	0	11.58	0	94.51	0	161.37	0
FEDERAL FUNDS	8.65	0	89.33	0	4.03	0	1.15	0	108.63	0	169.57	0

IMPORTANT - ALL FTE BASED ON 40/900 HOUR EQUIVALENTS.

NOTE: RESEARCH (2.0) INCLUDED WITH INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT
WORK-STUDY (8.0) INCLUDED WITH STUDENT SERVICES
DATE LAST UPDATE - 20388

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

FULL COST SUMMARY REPORT FROM CA-3
(1986 - 1987)
FOR
ALL COLLEGES

CCMIS 310
02/09/88
02:33 PM

CODES	PROGRAMS	FTE	INSTRUCTIONAL COST/FTE	OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL COST/FTE	COLLEGE-WIDE COST/FTE	TOTAL COST/FTE
1.1101	AGRIC/NAT RES.	5.1	6,274.12	1,281.96	1,935.87	9,491.95
1.1102	ARCHIT/ENVIRON					
1.1104	BIOLOGY	4,130.6	1,398.19	489.16	1,935.87	3,823.22
1.1109	ENGINEERING	14.2	2,154.79	394.73	1,935.87	4,485.39
1.1112	HEALTH	30.8	1,630.48	87.01	1,935.87	3,653.36
1.1119	PHYS.SCIENCE	6,295.4	1,572.34	417.87	1,935.87	3,926.08
1.1100	TOTAL PHYS. SCIENCES	10,476.1	1,506.92	445.40	1,935.87	3,888.19
1.1210	FINE ARTS	4,606.3	2,091.93	598.95	1,935.87	4,626.75
1.1311	FOREIGN LANG.	1,634.3	1,539.84	301.45	1,935.87	3,777.16
1.1315	LETTERS	16,895.4	1,373.05	296.68	1,935.87	3,605.60
1.1300	TOTAL LETTERS/LANG.	18,529.7	1,387.76	297.10	1,935.87	3,620.73
1.1408	EDUCATION	3,614.7	1,820.81	798.32	1,935.87	4,555.00
1.1505	BUS/MANAGEMENT	267.1	1,379.57	352.11	1,935.87	3,667.55
1.1607	COMPUTER SCI.	177.5	1,671.87	151.18	1,935.87	3,758.92
1.1617	MATHEMATICS	12,370.6	1,189.48	255.65	1,935.87	3,381.00
1.1600	TOTAL MATH/COMP.SCI.	12,548.1	1,196.30	254.18	1,935.87	3,386.35
1.1703	AREA STUDIES	132.3	854.37	172.79	1,935.87	2,963.03
1.1720	PSYCHOLOGY	5,401.1	1,174.65	251.23	1,935.87	3,361.75
1.1722	SOCIAL SCIENCES	10,969.3	1,192.64	248.26	1,935.87	3,376.77
1.1700	TOTAL SOC. SCIENCES	16,502.7	1,184.04	248.62	1,935.87	3,368.53
1.1806	COMMUNICATIONS	415.7	1,985.54	426.25	1,935.87	4,347.66
1.1813	HOME ECONOMICS	32.7	2,210.86	463.84	1,935.87	4,610.57
1.1814	LAW					
1.1816	LIBRARY SCIENCE	8.8	608.52		1,935.87	2,544.39
1.1818	MILITARY SCIENCE	28.9	1,019.92	197.24	1,935.87	3,153.03
1.1821	PUBLIC AFFAIRS	45.1	1,246.76	1,233.75	1,935.87	4,416.38
1.1823	THEOLOGY					
1.1849	INTERDISC.	3,245.3	1,333.44	306.05	1,935.87	3,575.36
1.1800	TOT. OTHER DISCS.	3,776.5	1,407.69	330.18	1,935.87	3,673.74
1.1000	TOTAL A/P	70,321.2	1,392.97	347.68	1,935.87	3,676.52
1.2101	AGRICULT/TECH	393.4	1,588.52	747.53	1,935.87	4,271.92
1.2102	AGRICULT/VOC	331.2	1,207.21	260.66	1,935.87	3,403.74
1.2103	AGRICULT/SUPP	30.3	452.38	460.76	1,935.87	2,849.01
1.2100	TOTAL AGRICULTURE	754.9	1,375.62	522.42	1,935.87	3,833.91

FTE BASED ON 40/900 HOUR EQUIVALENTS.

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

DIRECT COST OF INSTRUCTION BY COLLEGE
1986-1987
1.1000 TOTAL A/P - COST PER FTE

		- - - - - PERSONNEL COSTS		- - - -			
COLLEGE	F.T.E.	INSTRUCTIONAL	ADMINISTRATIVE	SUPPORT STAFF	SUPPLIES SERVICES	EQUIPMENT DEPRECIATION	TOTAL
MANATEE	2,119.7	1,150.98	96.36	99.92	73.42	18.61	1,439.29
BROWARD	5,719.3	1,235.81	79.84	99.13	54.81	15.58	1,485.16
TALLAHASSEE	2,266.3	1,290.46	58.43	74.42	62.77	9.55	1,495.64
EDISON	1,774.9	1,075.55	158.17	148.35	88.06	25.59	1,495.73
PASCO-HERNANDO	701.5	1.188.94	193.59	91.59	14.71	11.69	1,500.52
SANTA FE	3,028.7	1,355.85	72.24	98.92	30.58	9.98	1,567.57
GULF COAST	1,319.7	1,352.17	77.58	75.08	89.47	14.21	1,608.51
INDIAN RIVER	1,598.3	1,335.61	8.12	44.87	221.88	21.18	1,631.66
ST. PETERSBURG	5,005.0	1,404.41	133.21	7.34	89.06	20.40	1,654.42
HILLSBOROUGH	4,089.9	1,230.01	116.35	214.38	93.66	13.92	1,668.31
SEMINOLE	1,653.4	1,302.44	128.49	194.24	80.23	25.00	1,730.40
SOUTH FLORIDA	386.6	1,535.41		55.70	119.55	28.32	1,738.98
BREVARD	3,227.1	1,444.63	112.33	55.60	113.59	45.91	1,772.05
DAYTONA BEACH	2,073.1	1,360.83	83.17	152.36	154.27	34.81	1,785.44
MIAMI-DADE	14,741.8	1,433.46	72.80	189.70	83.61	15.40	1,794.97
VALENCIA	3,704.5	1,179.52	245.45	200.66	147.87	29.81	1,803.32
CENTRAL FLORIDA	993.2	1,602.41	32.99	96.42	51.51	25.66	1,808.99
FLA CC AT JAX	4,218.7	1,659.24	82.13	27.82	43.52	24.45	1,837.16
OKALOOSA-WALTON	1,022.4	1,701.89	43.45	50.48	53.20	10.28	1,859.30
PALM BEACH	3,551.4	1,262.53	84.33	131.96	333.91	69.79	1,882.53
POLK	1,336.5	1,536.33	147.87	85.30	77.11	58.28	1,904.89
LAKE-SUMTER	472.6	1,704.14	125.81	20.54	59.55	20.12	1,930.15
NORTH FLORIDA	360.3	1,780.44	59.56	47.80	94.80	42.75	2,025.36
PENSACOLA	2,936.2	1,587.75	71.92	258.05	64.48	52.25	2,034.46
ST. JOHNS RIVER	572.4	1,732.45	115.53	68.46	158.27	27.39	2,102.10
CHIPOLA	583.6	2,048.98	109.03	89.35	109.85	24.53	2,381.75
LAKE CITY	528.9	2,123.55	20.38	156.75	60.39	67.78	2,428.85
FLORIDA KEYS	335.2	2,014.03	261.25	130.66	233.14	83.92	2,722.99
TOTAL WGTED AVG	70,321.2	1,392.97	97.52	126.37	98.29	25.50	1,740.65

SOURCES: FAFVOCS487 01/26/88 CA 287 02/03/88

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

PERSONNEL - POSITIONS, EXPENDITURES, AND COST
1986-1987
1.1000 TOTAL A/P

CCNIS 510
02/09/88
02:48 PM

	- - - INSTRUCTIONAL - - -			- - ADMINISTRATIVE - -			- - - SUPPORT STAFF - - -			PERSONNEL COSTS
	FTE POSI	EXPEND	/POSI	FTE POSI	EXPEND	/POSI	FTE POSI	EXPEND	/POSI	PER FTE STUDENT
MANATEE	81.55	2,439,727	29,917	4.73	204,254	43,183	11.62	211,799	18,227	1,347.26
EDISON	69.58	1,909,002	27,436	6.30	280,737	44,561	15.14	263,313	17,392	1,382.08
INDIAN RIVER	75.85	2,134,712	28,144	0.29	12,978	44,750	4.10	71,710	17,490	1,388.60
BROWARD	221.17	7,067,966	31,957	10.97	456,601	41,623	31.25	566,946	18,142	1,414.77
TALLAHASSEE	64.78	2,924,573	45,146	2.38	132,423	55,640	10.50	168,667	16,064	1,423.32
PASCO-HERNANDO	33.04	834,040	25,243	2.85	135,605	47,651	4.39	64,250	14,635	1,474.12
PALM BEACH	137.96	4,483,758	32,500	6.12	299,494	48,937	24.07	468,653	19,470	1,478.83
GULF COAST	58.99	1,784,457	30,250	2.12	102,388	48,296	4.50	99,080	22,018	1,504.83
SANTA FE	115.20	4,106,450	35,646	5.50	218,804	39,783	17.80	299,597	16,831	1,527.01
ST. PETERSBURG	182.56	7,029,068	38,503	13.55	666,714	49,204	2.49	36,735	14,753	1,544.96
HILLSBOROUGH	167.54	5,030,615	30,026	10.44	475,844	45,579	48.55	876,802	18,060	1,560.74
SOUTH FLORIDA	25.77	593,588	23,034				1.00	21,532	21,532	1,591.10
DAYTONA BEACH	121.58	2,821,136	23,204	5.00	172,423	34,485	22.29	315,847	14,170	1,596.36
BREVARD	141.00	4,661,954	33,064	8.10	362,499	44,753	12.20	179,419	14,706	1,612.55
SEMINOLE	73.45	2,153,462	29,319	4.17	212,444	50,946	20.12	321,150	15,962	1,626.17
VALENCIA	163.00	4,369,518	26,807	22.30	909,285	40,775	40.30	743,351	18,445	1,626.63
MIAMI-DADE	617.82	21,131,832	34,204	24.27	1,073,230	44,220	156.42	2,796,519	17,878	1,695.97
CENTRAL FLORIDA	57.70	1,591,517	27,583	1.00	32,765	32,765	5.10	95,761	18,777	1,731.82
FLA CC AT JAX	177.80	6,999,855	39,369	8.09	346,472	42,827	5.04	117,346	23,283	1,769.19
POLK	59.68	2,053,303	34,405	4.45	197,633	44,412	7.03	114,008	16,217	1,769.50
OKALOOSA WALTON	46.96	1,740,010	37,053	1.02	44,419	43,548	3.87	51,611	13,336	1,795.81
LAKE-SUMTER	27.10	805,377	29,719	1.38	59,457	43,084	0.43	9,707	22,575	1,850.49
NORTH FLORIDA	20.09	641,493	31,931	0.43	21,460	49,908	1.64	17,223	10,502	1,887.81
ST. JOHNS RIVER	35.45	991,652	27,973	2.02	66,130	32,738	3.00	39,188	13,063	1,916.44
PENSACOLA	131.98	4,661,962	35,323	2.93	211,171	72,072	45.10	757,673	16,800	1,917.72
CHIPOLA	30.57	1,195,784	39,116	2.10	63,630	30,300	2.00	52,147	26,073	2,247.36
LAKE CITY	38.93	1,123,145	28,850	0.35	10,779	30,796	7.64	82,907	10,852	2,300.68
FLORIDA KEYS	29.90	675,102	22,579	2.51	87,570	34,888	2.49	43,797	17,589	2,406.93
TOTAL WGTED AVG	3,007.00	97,955,056	32,576	155.37	6,857,408	44,136	510.08	8,886,738	17,422	1,616.86

SOURCES: FAFVOCS487 01/26/88 CA287 02/03/88

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

DIRECT COST OF SUPPORT PROGRAMS BY COLLEGE
1986-1987
2.0000 TOTAL SUPPORT - COST PER FTE

CCMIS 308
02/09/88
02:41 PM

COLLEGE	F.T.E.	- - - - - PERSONNEL COSTS - - - - EXEC. ADMIN. MANAGERIAL	NON-INSTRUCT. PROFESSIONAL	SUPPORT STAFF	SUPPLIES SERVICES	EQUIPMENT DEPRECIATION	TOTAL
SEMINOLE	5,464.6	169.07	319.85	471.29	439.17	47.63	1,447.01
TALLAHASSEE	3,172.3	239.98	234.55	522.32	410.20	83.62	1,490.66
DAYTONA BEACH	7,347.9	216.89	77.73	789.71	449.63	21.53	1,555.49
SOUTH FLORIDA	1,875.3	273.21	172.68	488.37	578.61	77.91	1,590.79
EDISON	2,955.[illegible]	294.09	142.06	685.96	467.58	34.31	1,624.00
PASCO-HERNANDO	1,718.8	298.66	154.81	534.87	640.01	63.68	1,692.03
INDIAN RIVER	5,421.9	142.09	283.56	700.37	521.99	53.49	1,701.49
VALENCIA	6,706.9	104.86	234.93	828.17	501.04	61.84	1,730.84
PALM BEACH	6,216.6	270.58	287.43	855.98	319.27	83.64	1,816.91
LAKE CITY	2,310.1	344.66	155.86	654.86	673.80	53.77	1,882.95
HILLSBOROUGH	6,444.6	214.00	246.18	667.26	696.43	83.42	1,907.29
SANTA FE	5,700.5	220.78	341.31	864.05	436.35	54.27	1,916.77
ST. PETERSBURG	8,721.0	211.48	388.13	818.50	405.35	93.79	1,918.25
CENTRAL FLORIDA	2,460.3	253.93	330.98	777.41	493.31	65.35	1,920.98
NORTH FLORIDA	982.3	266.36	340.96	725.11	516.69	84.90	1,934.03
BREVARD	7,556.8	228.72	506.45	523.37	612.26	73.24	1,944.04
MANATEE	3,361.1	329.42	334.23	781.72	496.64	45.07	1,987.08
PENSACOLA	7,485.2	208.55	319.65	740.42	601.97	115.82	1,986.42
BROWARD	10,209.3	240.16	174.25	883.31	635.38	56.62	1,989.72
OKALOOSA-WALTON	2,119.3	357.57	293.00	815.17	447.22	77.34	1,990.31
ST. JOHNS RIVER	969.0	586.39	198.32	641.28	603.83	43.29	2,073.11
POLK	2,374.4	349.82	233.55	875.61	573.11	45.96	2,078.05
GULF COAST	2,290.4	258.80	445.09	703.26	608.58	65.00	2,080.72
FLA CC AT JAX	12,578.2	247.53	250.98	994.89	551.97	62.70	2,108.08
MIAMI-DADE	26,028.9	122.99	614.53	822.01	537.11	70.08	2,166.72
CHIPOLA	1,090.3	346.49	517.57	655.70	984.01	75.94	2,579.71
LAKE-SUMTER	898.1	348.77	687.58	1,141.68	780.12	113.89	3,072.05
FLORIDA KEYS	704.6	596.76	507.81	1,098.24	1,040.47	89.17	3,332.46
TOTAL WGTED AVG	145,163.8	217.12	341.68	775.52	534.23	67.33	1,935.87

SOURCES: FAFVOCS487 01/26/88 CA287 02/03/88

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

PERSONNEL - POSITIONS, EXPENDITURES, AND COST
1986-1987
2.0000 TOTAL SUPPORT

CCMIS 510
02/09/88
02:00 PM

	- - EXEC, ADMIN, MAN - - - - INSTRUCTIONAL - - -			- OTHER PROFESSIONAL - - - ADMINISTRATIVE - -			- - - SUPPORT STAFF - - -			PERSONNEL COSTS PER FTE STUDENT
	FTE POSI	EXPEND	/POSI	FTE POSI	EXPEND	/POSI	FTE POSI	EXPEND	/POSI	
SOUTH FLORIDA	10.00	512,360	51,236	12.50	323,823	25,906	53.70	915,842	17,055	934.26
SEMINOLE	14.63	923,913	63,152	44.64	1,747,862	39,155	168.69	2,678,409	16,267	960.21
PASCO-HERNANDO	11.50	513,345	44,639	10.00	266,094	26,609	64.01	919,334	14,362	988.35
TALLAHASSEE	13.62	761,275	55,894	18.47	744,060	40,285	107.28	1,656,960	15,445	996.85
DAYTONA BEACH	30.00	1,593,719	53,124	20.09	571,155	28,430	331.67	5,802,689	17,495	1,084.33
EDISON	21.50	869,080	40,422	15.08	419,805	27,839	128.72	2,027,075	15,748	1,122.11
INDIAN RIVER	12.54	770,377	61,434	36.80	1,537,424	41,778	182.09	3,797,342	20,854	1,126.02
HILLSBOROUGH	24.94	1,379,147	55,299	63.44	1,586,551	25,009	238.20	4,300,188	18,053	1,127.44
LAKE CITY	23.21	796,205	34,304	15.68	360,054	22,963	137.68	1,512,787	10,988	1,165.38
VALENCIA	12.70	703,276	55,376	35.50	1,575,632	44,384	349.30	5,554,448	15,902	1,167.95
BREVARD	30.90	1,728,386	55,935	133.30	3,827,119	28,711	492.70	3,955,022	8,027	1,258.64
PENSACOLA	29.20	1,561,016	53,459	78.04	2,392,674	30,660	373.45	5,542,167	14,840	1,268.62
BROWARD	46.20	2,451,875	53,071	44.15	1,778,939	40,293	500.67	9,017,986	18,012	1,297.72
NORTH FLORIDA	4.00	261,642	65,411	12.42	334,928	26,967	49.65	712,277	14,346	1,332.43
CENTRAL FLORIDA	12.50	624,743	49,979	24.30	814,309	33,511	110.80	1,912,662	17,262	1,362.92
GULF COAST	10.50	592,745	56,452	30.57	1,019,440	33,348	89.53	1,610,737	17,991	1,407.14
PALM BEACH	29.37	1,682,113	57,273	50.63	1,786,851	35,292	262.78	5,321,315	20,250	1,414.00
MANATEE	21.31	1,107,214	51,957	39.31	1,123,388	28,578	149.36	2,526,595	16,916	1,415.37
ST. PETERSBURG	30.64	1,844,291	60,192	84.47	3,384,899	40,072	426.84	7,138,174	16,723	1,418.11
ST. JOHNS RIVER	11.70	568,211	48,565	7.15	192,170	26,877	42.35	621,399	14,673	1,426.99
SANTA FE	26.90	1,258,582	46,787	57.40	1,945,651	33,896	322.80	4,925,531	15,259	1,426.15
POLK	16.06	830,604	51,719	15.98	554,551	34,703	125.26	2,079,049	16,598	1,458.98
OKALOOSA-WALTON	14.64	757,806	51,763	16.25	620,955	38,213	104.00	1,727,647	16,612	1,465.75
FLA CC AT JAX	64.80	3,113,503	48,048	77.98	3,156,865	40,483	671.40	12,513,971	18,639	1,493.40
CHIPOLA	8.52	377,783	44,341	18.99	564,304	29,716	48.90	714,914	14,620	1,519.77
MIAMI-DADE	51.05	3,201,418	62,711	473.06	15,995,422	33,813	1,467.77	21,396,060	14,577	1,559.63
LAKE-SUMTER	6.00	313,234	52,206	19.79	617,512	31,203	64.76	1,025,345	15,833	2,178.03
FLORIDA KEYS	8.00	420,476	52,560	11.18	357,803	32,004	47.44	773,817	16,311	2,202.80
TOTAL WGTED AVG	596.93	31,518,332	52,801	1,467.17	49,600,216	33,807	7,111.80	112,576,708	15,830	1,334.92

SOURCES: FAFVOCS487 01/26/88 CA287 02/03/88

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

DIRECT COST OF SUPPORT PROGRAMS BY COLLEGE
1985-1986
4.1000 LEARNING RESOURCE - COST PER FTE

CCMIS 308
02/03/87
01:19 PM

		PERSONNEL COSTS					
COLLEGE	F.T.E.	EXEC, ADMIN, MANAGERIAL	NON-INSTRUCT. PROFESSIONAL	SUPPORT STAFF	SUPPLIES SERVICES	EQUIPMENT DEPRECIATION	TOTAL
INDIAN RIVER	5,030.9		32.95	15.40	7.88	13.16	69.40
SOUTH FLORIDA	1,713.0	21.27		28.91	9.51	23.05	82.74
SEMINOLE	5,618.8	10.02	31.18	36.16	15.16	18.48	111.01
LAKE CITY	2,505.6	10.30	24.54	33.96	22.36	20.89	112.06
VALENCIA	6,385.2	4.26	36.46	38.45	16.19	25.06	120.42
DAYTONA BEACH	7,340.1	14.22	53.70	41.42	12.00		121.33
ST. JOHNS RIVER	763.1	35.95	32.78	52.92	17.12	7.03	145.80
SANTA FE	5,470.6	7.74	43.76	62.67	19.33	14.23	147.74
MANATEE	3,234.2	13.28	55.07	56.12	20.99	14.71	160.17
PASCO-HERNANDO	1,662.8	21.48	37.92	59.69	24.72	17.04	160.86
BROWARD	9,770.3	18.12	38.15	80.07	13.67	11.07	161.08
CHIPOLA	1,091.4	28.75	56.11	49.98	22.37	6.88	164.09
HILLSBOROUGH	5,889.0			125.78	11.24	27.73	164.75
NORTH FLORIDA	907.9		46.17	89.93	12.48	18.29	166.86
PALM BEACH	5,959.7	16.91	37.66	70.12	28.21	14.29	167.19
TALLAHASSEE	2,794.9	17.92	45.22	57.04	19.29	35.24	174.72
FLA JC AT JAX	12,470.4	19.60	45.96	68.61	20.99	31.88	187.04
CENTRAL FLORIDA	2,244.7	20.09	48.10	72.72	17.78	29.04	187.72
BREVARD	7,009.6	11.83	85.13	35.63	44.43	20.86	197.87
ST. PETERSBURG	8,492.8	12.60	62.45	68.43	17.86	41.30	202.63
POLK	2,319.1	19.13	43.83	99.11	27.89	16.01	205.96
EDISON	2,747.3	30.70	53.43	90.96	21.03	12.12	208.24
OKALOOSA-WALTON	2,115.3	18.06	66.65	74.39	19.08	30.16	208.35
FLORIDA KEYS	711.5	49.94	13.16	96.57	25.88	23.26	208.82
GULF COAST	2,107.9	23.65	73.41	69.70	34.27	25.81	226.84
MIAMI-DADE	24,795.2	13.77	60.54	112.34	29.79	30.07	246.51
PENSACOLA	7,446.9	15.82	52.67	94.83	82.41	6.93	252.66
LAKE-SUMTER	903.2		99.34	100.91	40.95	35.09	276.29
TOTAL: WEIGHTED AVERAGE	139,501.4	13.97	48.07	72.76	24.96	21.89	181.66

SOURCES:FAFVOCS486 01/27/87 CA286202/02/87

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

DIRECT COST SUMMARY REPORT FROM CA-2 AND CA-3

UNIT COSTS (1985-1986)

CCMIS 306
02/13/87
09:11 AM

ALL COLLEGES

PROGRAM.	ADVAN + PROF		VOCATIONAL		DEVELOPMENTAL		C. I. S.		*TOTAL INSTR*		COMMUNITY SER	
	COST/FTE	PCT	COST/FTE	PCT	COST/FTE	PCT	COST/FTE	PCT	COST/FTE	PCT	COST/FTE	PCT
PERSONNEL COSTS.												
INSTRUCTIONAL	1360.83	81	1464.90	68	817.91	75	688.86	51	1294.49	74	0.00	0
ADMINISTRATIVE	90.28	5	149.84	7	63.62	6	167.41	12	108.80	6	1.03	3
OTHER PROF.	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	5.41	17
SUPPORT	123.21	7	214.39	10	123.16	11	243.36	18	157.89	9	9.54	29
TOTAL PERS. COST	1574.32	93	1829.13	85	1004.69	93	1099.63	81	1561.18	89	15.98	49
SUPPLIES + SERV.	88.64	5	239.82	11	70.76	7	255.68	19	142.51	8	13.71	42
EQUIP. DEPRECIA.	23.57	1	92.20	4	7.88	1	8.12	1	44.34	3	2.73	8
*** TOTAL COSTS	1686.53	100	2161.15	100	1083.33	100	1363.43	100	1748.03	100	32.43	100
EQUIP. EXPEND.	30.37	0	113.14	0	11.54	0	9.52	0	55.65	0	2.26	0
FEDERAL FUNDS	18.12	0	124.44	0	73.80	0	49.37	0	64.13	0	3.62	0

PROGRAM.	ACADEMIC SUPP		STUDENT SERV		INSTITUTIONAL		PLANT OPER.		*TOTAL SUPPORT*		**GRAND TOTAL**	
	COST/FTE	PCT	COST/FTE	PCT	COST/FTE	PCT	COST/FTE	PCT	COST/FTE	PCT	COST/FTE	PCT
PERSONNEL COSTS.												
INSTRUCTIONAL	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	1294.49	36
ADMINISTRATIVE	60.08	17	45.04	10	102.33	17	6.44	1	214.93	12	323.73	9
OTHER PROF.	88.76	25	128.84	29	76.36	13	9.72	2	309.09	17	309.09	9
SUPPORT	116.50	33	201.61	46	202.01	33	215.74	49	745.40	40	903.29	25
TOTAL PERS. COST	265.34	76	375.50	86	380.71	63	231.90	52	1269.42	68	2830.60	78
SUPPLIES + SERV.	59.27	17	58.92	13	201.39	33	203.81	46	537.10	29	679.61	19
EQUIP. DEPRECIA.	26.38	8	4.75	1	22.20	4	6.07	1	62.14	3	106.48	3
*** TOTAL COSTS	350.98	100	439.17	100	604.30	100	441.78	100	1868.66	100	3616.69	100
EQUIP. EXPEND.	32.83	0	8.50	0	28.83	0	8.84	0	79.27	0	134.91	0
FEDERAL FUNDS	11.86	0	78.13	0	4.44	0	0.34	0	98.39	0	162.52	0

IMPORTANT - ALL FTE BASED ON 40/900 HOUR EQUIVALENTS.

NOTE: RESEARCH (2.0) INCLUDED WITH INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT
WORK-STUDY (8.0) INCLUDED WITH STUDENT SERVICES
DATE LAST UPDATE - 21387

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

CCMIS 310
02/13/87
09:13 AM

FULL COST SUMMARY REPORT FROM CA-3
(1985 - 1986)
FOR
ALL COLLEGES

CODES	PROGRAMS	FTE	INSTRUCTIONAL COST/FTE	OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL COST/FTE	COLLEGE-WIDE COST/FTE	TOTAL COST/FTE
1.1101	AGRIC/NAT RES.	5.6	4,945.89	429.29	1,868.66	7,243.84
1.1102	ARCHIT/ENVIRON					
1.1104	BIOLOGY	3,922.8	1,361.77	409.02	1,868.66	3,639.45
1.1109	ENGINEERING	14.9	1,613.00	371.78	1,868.66	3,853.44
1.1112	HEALTH	18.3	1,948.01	279.69	1,868.66	4,096.36
1.1119	PHYS.SCIENCE	6,133.8	1,515.32	389.60	1,868.66	3,773.58
1.1100	TOTAL PHYS. SCIENCES	10,095.4	1,458.49	396.94	1,868.66	3,724.09
1.1210	FINE ARTS	4,361.4	2,024.81	611.28	1,868.66	4,504.75
1.1311	FOREIGN LANG.	1,439.2	1,539.54	285.49	1,868.66	3,693.69
1.1315	LETTERS	15,851.9	1,350.98	249.66	1,868.66	3,469.30
1.1300	TOTAL LETTERS/LANG.	17,291.1	1,366.68	252.64	1,868.66	3,487.98
1.1408	EDUCATION	3,600.9	1,832.39	818.51	1,868.66	4,519.56
1.1505	BUS/MANAGEMENT	118.6	860.15	552.84	1,868.66	3,281.65
1.1607	COMPUTER SCI.	24.5	1,690.21	244.72	1,868.66	3,803.59
1.1617	MATHEMATICS	11,811.0	1,144.62	228.86	1,868.66	3,242.14
1.1600	TOTAL MATH/COMP.SCI.	11,835.5	1,145.75	228.90	1,868.66	3,243.31
1.1703	AREA STUDIES	119.9	646.45	604.37	1,868.66	3,119.48
1.1720	PSYCHOLOGY	5,088.9	1,138.00	232.89	1,868.66	3,239.55
1.1722	SOCIAL SCIENCES	10,183.6	1,184.86	230.37	1,868.66	3,283.89
1.1700	TOTAL SOC. SCIENCES	15,392.4	1,165.17	234.12	1,868.66	3,267.95
1.1806	COMMUNICATIONS	321.0	1,984.78	431.18	1,868.66	4,284.62
1.1813	HOME ECONOMICS	34.5	2,170.60	1,149.84	1,868.66	5,189.10
1.1814	LAW					
1.1816	LIBRARY SCIENCE	7.3	1,973.85	4.46	1,868.66	3,846.97
1.1818	MILITARY SCIENCE	18.0	815.85	198.61	1,868.66	2,883.12
1.1821	PUBLIC AFFAIRS	27.8	1,244.32	335.10	1,868.66	3,448.08
1.1823	THEOLOGY					
1.1849	INTERDISC.	3,075.5	1,268.41	323.94	1,868.66	3,461.01
1.1800	TOT. OTHER DISCS.	3,484.1	1,342.29	340.77	1,868.66	3,551.72
1.1000	TOTAL A/P	66,179.4	1,360.83	325.70	1,868.66	3,555.19
1.2101	AGRICULT/TECH	401.7	1,992.12	674.22	1,868.66	4,535.00
1.2102	AGRICULT/VOC	354.2	1,415.72	417.38	1,868.66	3,701.76
1.2103	AGRICULT/SUPP	14.6	935.92	584.08	1,868.66	3,388.66
1.2100	TOTAL AGRICULTURE	770.5	1,707.14	554.44	1,868.66	4,130.24

FTE BASED ON 40/900 HOUR EQUIVALENTS.

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

DIRECT COST OF INSTRUCTION BY COLLEGE
1985-1986
1.1000 TOTAL A/P - COST PER FTE

CCMIS 308
02/13/87
09:21 AM

COLLEGE	F.T.E.	- - - - - PERSONNEL COSTS INSTRUCTIONAL	ADMINISTRATIVE	SUPPORT STAFF - - - -	SUPPLIES SERVICES	EQUIPMENT DEPRECIATION	TOTAL
HILLSBOROUGH	3,387.0	1,235.25	16.47	117.06	22.15	14.08	1,405.01
BROWARD	5,567.4	1,145.23	53.12	119.23	86.74	15.60	1,419.91
TALLAHASSEE	1,997.1	1,240.75	64.55	70.31	47.70	9.68	1,432.98
MANATEE	1,868.7	1,144.99	94.80	100.56	78.94	23.99	1,443.30
SANTA FE	2,840.1	1,264.01	63.07	92.95	23.58	10.98	1,454.58
ST. PETERSBURG	4,839.6	1,325.34	96.08	11.32	77.03	19.49	1,529.27
EDISON	1,609.7	1,134.11	162.40	139.70	75.50	26.49	1,538.19
PASCO-HERNANDO	638.8	1,267.30	188.42	94.38	18.76	15.71	1,584.58
GULF COAST	1,204.8	1,385.41	66.98	68.58	93.32	13.41	1,627.71
VALENCIA	3,588.5	1,117.81	232.37	167.10	98.54	18.60	1,634.43
INDIAN RIVER	1,613.9	1,330.26	9.00	32.97	241.41	90.79	1,704.43
OKALOOSA-WALTON	1,034.2	1,564.78	40.53	51.45	55.27	10.88	1,722.91
PALM BEACH	3,404.3	1,197.39	73.14	118.44	297.24	39.07	1,725.27
MIAMI-DADE	14,420.2	1,365.49	109.08	173.62	67.04	15.12	1,730.35
FLA JC AT JAX	3,843.9	1,611.63	77.64	40.43	50.40	23.54	1,803.63
DAYTONA BEACH	1,928.2	1,454.55	94.44	162.94	126.07	9.48	1,847.48
POLK	1,293.8	1,470.25	100.55	99.76	125.12	60.76	1,856.44
BREVARD	2,968.2	1,592.79	95.33	44.73	95.15	42.95	1,870.96
CENTRAL FLORIDA	901.7	1,645.95	20.58	100.17	79.22	28.26	1,874.18
SEMINOLE	1,488.3	1,497.10	96.67	173.37	78.45	33.55	1,879.14
LAKE-SUMTER	474.2	1,672.37	120.77	17.97	70.73	27.92	1,909.77
NORTH FLORIDA	375.0	1,684.65	48.89	55.00	91.05	41.45	1,921.04
PENSACOLA	2,657.7	1,480.10	46.26	425.24	63.63	35.65	2,050.88
CHIPOLA	587.0	1,774.98	111.76	102.05	90.19	17.69	2,096.67
SOUTH FLORIDA	311.6	1,960.74	89.28	36.64	172.65	35.13	2,294.43
LAKE CITY	535.2	2,124.88	9.03	124.39	55.82	27.95	2,342.07
ST. JOHNS RIVER	470.8	1,958.02	154.30	80.45	192.74	30.07	2,415.59
FLORIDA KEYS	329.5	1,874.06	220.95	155.41	203.22	82.41	2,536.04
TOTAL: WEIGHTED AVERAGE	66,179.4	1,360.83	90.28	123.21	88.64	23.57	1,686.53

SOURCES:FAFVOCS486 01/27/87 CA286 02/13/87

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

PERSONNEL - POSITIONS, EXPENDITURES, AND COST
1985-1986
1.1000 TOTAL A/P

CCMIS 510
02/16/87
09:58 AM

	- - - INSTRUCTIONAL - - -			- - ADMINISTRATIVE - -			- - - SUPPORT STAFF - - -			PERSONNEL COSTS
COLLEGE	FTE POSI	EXPEND	/POSI	FTE POSI	EXPEND	/POSI	FTE POSI	EXPEND	/POSI	PER FTE STUDENT
BROWARD	205.07	6,375,941	31,092	7.00	295,737	42,248	33.69	663,819	19,704	1,317.58
MANATEE	73.46	2,139,652	29,127	4.26	177,161	41,587	12.79	187,924	14,693	1,340.36
HILLSBOROUGH	144.00	4,183,781	29,054	1.18	55,769	47,262	27.15	396,492	14,604	1,368.78
INDIAN RIVER	77.85	2,146,908	27,577	0.36	14,522	40,339	3.97	53,216	13,405	1,372.23
TALLAHASSEE	59.57	2,477,898	41,596	3.06	128,904	42,125	11.06	140,423	12,696	1,375.61
PALM BEACH	135.15	4,076,274	30,161	5.08	248,981	49,012	24.81	403,193	16,251	1,388.96
SANTA FE	121.80	3,589,902	29,474	5.10	179,120	35,122	16.90	263,979	15,620	1,420.02
ST. PETERSBURG	175.33	6,414,130	36,583	9.06	465,006	51,325	4.96	54,768	11,042	1,432.74
EDISON	68.19	1,825,571	26,772	6.13	261,410	42,644	16.61	224,876	13,539	1,436.20
VALENCIA	160.40	4,011,264	25,008	18.60	833,863	44,831	35.50	599,644	16,891	1,517.28
GULF COAST	56.52	1,669,143	29,532	1.83	80,703	44,100	4.21	82,624	19,626	1,520.97
PASCO-HERNANDO	34.81	809,551	23,256	3.05	120,363	39,463	3.93	60,292	15,341	1,550.10
MIAMI-DADE	619.78	19,690,627	31,770	37.01	1,573,025	42,503	149.96	2,503,573	16,695	1,648.19
OKALOOSA-WALTON	47.44	1,618,299	34,113	1.01	41,921	41,506	3.97	53,206	13,402	1,656.77
POLK	57.66	1,902,212	32,990	2.47	130,092	52,669	7.78	129,067	16,590	1,670.56
DAYTONA BEACH	118.58	2,804,654	23,652	6.00	182,108	30,351	20.59	314,189	15,259	1,711.93
FLA JC AT JAX	167.60	6,194,939	36,963	6.60	298,433	45,217	9.00	155,390	17,266	1,729.69
BREVARD	131.61	4,727,716	35,922	11.04	282,959	25,630	8.90	132,781	14,919	1,732.85
CENTRAL FLORIDA	51.26	1,484,150	28,953	1.45	18,559	12,799	4.47	90,325	20,207	1,766.70
SEMINOLE	84.58	2,228,131	26,343	3.26	143,874	44,133	15.96	258,030	16,167	1,767.14
NORTH FLORIDA	21.84	631,744	28,926	0.35	18,333	52,380	1.34	20,626	15,392	1,788.54
LAKE-SUMTER	29.05	793,039	27,299	1.02	57,270	56,147	0.42	8,523	20,294	1,811.12
PENSACOLA	98.80	3,933,652	39,814	2.04	122,954	60,272	77.40	1,130,149	14,601	1,951.60
CHIPOLA	30.65	1,041,916	33,994	1.74	65,600	37,701	2.87	59,903	20,872	1,988.79
SOUTH FLORIDA	22.21	610,966	27,509	0.55	27,820	50,582	0.55	11,416	20,756	2,086.66
ST. JOHNS RIVER	32.01	921,838	28,798	2.07	72,646	35,095	2.80	37,874	13,526	2,192.77
FLORIDA KEYS	28.10	617,503	21,975	1.85	72,802	39,352	2.95	51,206	17,358	2,250.41
LAKE CITY	41.00	1,137,237	27,737	0.16	4,834	30,212	7.00	66,573	9,510	2,258.30
TOTAL: WEIGHTED AVERAGE	2,894.32	90,058,638	31,116	143.33	5,974,771	41,685	511.54	8,154,081	15,940	1,574.32

SOURCES:FAFVOCS486 01/27/87 CA286 02/13/87

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

DIRECT COST OF SUPPORT PROGRAMS BY COLLEGE
1985-1986
2.0000 TOTAL SUPPORT - COST PER FTE

CCMIS 308
02/03/87
01:20 PM

COLLEGE	F.T.E.	- - - - - PERSONNEL COSTS - - - - EXEC. ADMIN. MANAGERIAL	NON-INSTRUCT. PROFESSIONAL	SUPPORT STAFF	SUPPLIES SERVICES	EQUIPMENT DEPRECIATION	TOTAL
SEMINOLE	5,618.8	143.98	263.81	428.12	405.52	44.51	1,285.94
SOUTH FLORIDA	1,713.0	293.11	136.96	346.68	495.71	70.82	1,343.28
TALLAHASSEE	2,794.9	250.39	178.91	508.73	412.60	82.91	1,433.53
DAYTONA BEACH	7,340.1	177.05	128.16	712.05	427.71	17.18	1,462.15
LAKE CITY	2,505.6	299.95	75.15	482.05	568.87	51.43	1,477.44
PALM BEACH	5,959.7	277.63	267.61	718.85	286.25	61.48	1,611.82
EDISON	2,747.3	309.84	146.98	647.88	484.25	34.73	1,623.68
INDIAN RIVER	5,030.9	122.25	292.47	692.89	497.48	47.05	1,652.14
VALENCIA	6,385.2	140.85	241.65	743.07	509.80	51.63	1,686.99
PASCO-HERNANDO	1,662.8	295.09	146.17	577.37	607.57	62.95	1,689.16
NORTH FLORIDA	907.9	215.16	179.42	704.76	559.67	78.19	1,737.20
OKALOOSA-WALTON	2,115.3	285.62	258.61	723.91	420.63	68.78	1,757.55
ST. PETERSBURG	8,492.8	221.33	358.18	746.16	385.67	81.24	1,792.58
MANATEE	3,234.2	303.08	278.82	667.24	502.68	50.85	1,802.66
BREVARD	7,009.6	192.11	408.68	500.42	678.55	59.81	1,839.58
POLK	2,319.1	319.22	225.09	740.70	510.97	45.07	1,841.06
SANTA FE	5,470.6	205.04	300.92	873.89	426.21	52.27	1,858.34
PENSACOLA	7,446.9	194.63	297.82	699.25	612.70	89.95	1,894.36
BROWARD	9,770.3	221.77	183.04	794.99	683.71	52.77	1,936.27
FLA JC AT JAX	12,470.4	250.18	236.80	933.25	526.11	49.26	1,995.60
GULF COAST	2,107.9	258.55	376.82	732.17	580.57	58.21	2,006.34
CENTRAL FLORIDA	2,244.7	274.26	369.90	841.04	606.31	71.40	2,162.91
MIAMI-DADE	24,795.2	118.61	562.71	859.07	564.26	78.72	2,183.36
HILLSBOROUGH	5,889.0	353.81	146.53	869.71	760.38	84.10	2,214.54
CHIPOLA	1,091.4	351.20	422.67	539.07	914.05	73.83	2,300.82
ST. JOHNS RIVER	763.1	715.83	198.64	729.84	637.64	38.76	2,320.70
LAKE-SUMTER	903.2	333.19	545.65	985.74	633.13	106.19	2,603.91
FLORIDA KEYS	711.5	549.31	457.16	984.00	1,110.53	86.15	3,187.15
TOTAL: WEIGHTED AVERAGE	139,501.4	214.93	309.09	745.40	537.10	62.14	1,868.66

SOURCES:FAFVOCS486 01/27/87 CA286202/02/87

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

PERSONNEL - POSITIONS, EXPENDITURES, AND COST
1985-1986
2.0000 TOTAL SUPPORT

CCMIS 510
02/16/87
10:00 AM

COLLEGE	- - EXEC, ADMIN, MAN - - FTE POSI	EXPEND	/POSI	- OTHER PROFESSIONAL- - FTE POSI	EXPEND	/POSI	- - - SUPPORT STAFF - - - FTE POSI	EXPEND	/POSI	PERSONNEL COSTS PER FTE STUDENT
SOUTH FLORIDA	11.10	502,099	45,234	9.10	234,606	25,781	38.10	593,862	15,587	776.75
SEMINOLE	13.57	808,980	59,615	40.56	1,482,295	36,546	168.62	2,405,495	14,266	835.90
LAKE CITY	24.75	751,545	30,365	7.55	188,296	24,940	84.45	1,207,817	14,302	857.14
TALLAHASSEE	14.65	699,809	47,769	14.83	500,032	33,718	122.78	1,421,852	11,580	938.03
DAYTONA BEACH	25.00	1,299,600	51,984	21.19	940,698	44,393	335.80	5,226,502	15,564	1,017.26
PASCO-HERNANDO	12.00	490,682	40,890	9.90	243,059	24,551	70.15	960,046	13,686	1,018.64
NORTH FLORIDA	4.00	195,345	48,836	7.08	162,896	23,008	44.97	639,852	14,228	1,099.34
BREVARD	31.12	1,346,648	43,273	120.70	2,864,681	23,734	275.30	3,507,748	12,742	1,101.22
EDISON	21.10	851,219	40,342	20.89	403,802	19,330	123.49	1,779,911	14,413	1,104.70
INDIAN RIVER	10.00	615,010	61,501	36.13	1,471,362	40,724	176.39	3,485,876	19,762	1,107.60
VALENCIA	16.80	899,340	53,532	41.10	1,542,963	37,542	295.10	4,744,653	16,078	1,125.56
PENSACOLA	28.30	1,449,406	51,216	77.30	2,217,859	28,692	355.40	5,207,216	14,652	1,191.70
BROWARD	43.04	2,166,721	50,342	47.54	1,788,315	37,617	454.53	7,767,264	17,089	1,199.79
MANATEE	20.22	980,225	48,478	35.19	901,750	25,625	149.20	2,157,972	14,464	1,249.13
PALM BEACH	32.00	1,654,563	51,705	50.03	1,594,856	31,878	239.67	4,284,145	17,875	1,264.08
OKALOOSA-WALTON	12.65	604,180	47,761	14.61	547,041	37,443	97.87	1,531,282	15,646	1,268.14
POLK	15.07	740,314	49,125	17.10	522,003	30,526	112.12	1,717,755	15,321	1,285.01
CHIPOLA	8.94	383,302	42,875	18.10	461,303	25,486	46.62	588,336	12,620	1,312.94
ST. PETERSBURG	34.98	1,879,722	53,737	87.83	3,041,927	34,634	414.53	6,337,022	15,287	1,325.67
GULF COAST	10.50	545,002	51,905	23.04	794,309	34,475	86.29	1,543,351	17,886	1,367.55
HILLSBOROUGH	44.72	2,083,572	46,592	33.50	862,933	25,759	365.86	5,121,725	13,999	1,370.05
SANTA FE	26.10	1,121,718	42,978	52.20	1,646,189	31,536	325.50	4,780,699	14,687	1,379.85
FLA JC AT JAX	65.55	3,119,797	47,594	67.85	2,953,000	43,522	1,040.59	11,638,053	11,184	1,420.23
CENTRAL FLORIDA	12.50	615,633	49,251	24.56	830,306	33,807	116.65	1,887,872	16,184	1,485.19
MIAMI-DADE	51.38	2,940,912	57,238	449.14	13,952,447	31,065	1,507.65	21,300,712	14,128	1,540.38
ST. JOHNS RIVER	13.10	546,250	41,698	6.10	151,579	24,849	42.00	556,939	13,260	1,644.30
LAKE-SUMTER	6.00	300,937	50,156	15.20	492,832	32,423	57.00	890,322	15,620	1,864.58
FLORIDA KEYS	8.00	390,834	48,854	10.95	325,268	29,705	47.47	700,116	14,749	1,990.47
TOTAL: WEIGHTED AVERAGE	617.14	29,983,368	48,584	1,359.27	43,118,605	31,722	7,194.10	103,984,396	14,454	1,269.42

SOURCES:FAFVOCS486 01/27/87 CA286 02/13/87

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

DIRECT COST OF SUPPORT PROGRAMS BY COLLEGE
1984-1985
4.1000 LEARNING RESOURCE - COST PER FTE

CCMIS 308
01/22/86
03:27 PM

COLLEGE	F.T.E.	- - - - - PERSONNEL COSTS EXEC. ADMIN. MANAGERIAL	- - - - - NON-INSTRUCT. PROFESSIONAL	SUPPORT STAFF	SUPPLIES SERVICES	EQUIPMENT DEPRECIATION	TOTAL
INDIAN RIVER	4,896.8		25.15	11.18	6.38	10.20	52.91
SOUTH FLORIDA	1,424.1	23.78		35.65	11.72	36.91	108.06
LAKE CITY	2,346.4	4.05	25.59	33.16	24.17	31.07	118.03
SEMINOLE	5,394.5	9.96	28.24	37.86	35.57	18.01	129.64
VALENCIA	5,951.3		48.31	53.00	9.26	30.74	141.31
SANTA FE	5,129.8	12.91	42.61	51.85	19.71	18.56	145.64
MANATEE	3,184.0	12.01	47.63	52.13	20.74	13.87	146.39
DAYTONA BEACH	7,122.6	13.29	21.54	73.06	14.74	24.00	146.64
PASCO-HERNANDO	1,528.8	20.77	18.45	76.14	23.72	8.91	147.98
HILLSBOROUGH	5,824.4		0.33	127.21	12.99	13.42	153.95
BROWARD	10,017.6	17.44	32.93	89.33	12.77	15.86	168.33
ST. PETERSBURG	8,776.5	12.45	54.56	50.98	13.67	43.97	175.63
FLA JC AT JAX	12,086.6	19.28	44.89	66.72	25.29	21.33	177.51
FLORIDA KEYS	761.7	41.06		91.89	17.00	27.90	177.86
TALLAHASSEE	2,617.6	17.51	47.53	50.84	20.15	44.04	180.07
POLK	2,445.2	16.98	38.02	89.87	21.67	14.66	181.21
CENTRAL FLORIDA	2,147.5	19.49	45.80	63.12	13.61	39.50	181.51
OKALOOSA-WALTON	2,219.1	15.95	62.88	57.77	18.51	26.87	181.98
CHIPOLA	1,012.4	32.40	60.25	64.10	26.15	6.71	189.61
PALM BEACH	5,733.2	16.64	59.42	60.05	25.21	30.71	192.03
BREVARD	7,493.5	11.16	79.88	30.63	46.49	25.03	193.19
ST. JOHNS RIVER	716.3	42.22	69.78	57.34	17.81	7.37	194.51
EDISON	2,735.3	26.89	48.40	94.97	24.73	6.25	201.25
NORTH FLORIDA	677.7		98.44	59.91	23.12	24.62	206.08
MIAMI-DADE	24,422.1	9.01	58.93	107.07	25.43	34.44	234.88
GULF COAST	2,113.9	21.88	73.34	65.34	38.82	36.71	236.10
LAKE-SUMTER	926.9		91.90	86.95	34.63	33.82	247.30
PENSACOLA	7,407.5	16.21	67.12	118.93	85.22	86.26	373.74
TOTAL: WEIGHTED AVERAGE	137,113.3	12.71	46.74	73.24	25.24	29.00	186.93

SOURCES:FAFVOCS485 03/08/56 CA285207/20/09

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

DIRECT COST SUMMARY REPORT FROM CA-2 AND CA-3

UNIT COSTS (1984-1985)

ALL COLLEGES

CCMIS 306
02/21/86
10:28 AM

PROGRAM.	ADVAN + PROF COST/FTE	PCT	VOCATIONAL COST/FTE	PCT	DEVELOPMENTAL COST/FTE	PCT	C. I. S. COST/FTE	PCT	•TOTAL INSTR• COST/FTE	PCT	COMMUNITY SER COST/FTE	PCT
PERSONNEL COSTS.												
INSTRUCTIONAL	1317.82	80	1413.03	68	807.05	71	571.30	43	1265.98	74	0.00	0
ADMINISTRATIVE	86.20	5	140.88	7	89.52	8	217.72	16	109.86	6	1.32	6
OTHER PROF.	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	3.89	17
SUPPORT	119.15	7	191.26	9	139.18	12	281.46	21	152.05	9	7.08	32
TOTAL PERS. COST	1523.16	93	1745.17	84	1035.75	92	1070.48	80	1527.89	89	12.29	55
SUPPLIES + SERV.	88.00	5	216.46	10	83.03	7	250.86	19	137.92	8	8.89	40
EQUIP. DEPRECIA.	28.33	2	109.82	5	11.57	1	12.65	1	54.97	3	1.12	5
*** TOTAL COSTS	1639.50	100	2071.45	100	1130.34	100	1333.99	100	1720.78	100	22.30	100
EQUIP. EXPEND.	33.29	0	131.74	0	24.45	0	18.56	0	67.04	0	1.42	0
FEDERAL FUNDS	7.81	0	114.09	0	129.62	0	39.72	0	62.66	0	3.31	0

PROGRAM.	ACADEMIC SUPP COST/FTE	PCT	STUDENT SERV COST/FTE	PCT	INSTITUTIONAL COST/FTE	PCT	PLANT OPER. COST/FTE	PCT	•TOTAL SUPPORT• COST/FTE	PCT	••GRAND TOTAL•• COST/FTE	PCT
PERSONNEL COSTS.												
INSTRUCTIONAL	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	1265.98	36
ADMINISTRATIVE	61.31	17	42.63	10	98.33	17	6.81	2	210.40	12	320.27	9
OTHER PROF.	85.88	24	122.31	29	67.85	12	8.34	2	288.27	16	288.27	8
SUPPORT	110.59	31	192.05	46	192.70	34	209.97	47	712.39	40	864.44	25
TOTAL PERS. COST	257.78	73	356.99	86	358.88	64	225.12	51	1211.06	67	2738.95	78
SUPPLIES + SERV.	59.38	17	53.16	13	175.78	31	207.64	47	504.86	28	642.78	18
EQUIP. DEPRECIA.	34.68	10	6.74	2	28.41	5	9.65	2	80.60	4	135.57	4
*** TOTAL COSTS	351.85	100	416.89	100	563.08	100	442.40	100	1796.53	100	3517.30	100
EQUIP. EXPEND.	47.12	0	8.66	0	26.14	0	7.27	0	90.61	0	157.65	0
FEDERAL FUNDS	19.24	0	65.53	0	5.72	0	0.79	0	94.59	0	157.25	0

IMPORTANT - ALL FTE BASED ON 40/900 HOUR EQUIVALENTS.

NOTE: RESEARCH (2.0) INCLUDED WITH INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT
WORK-STUDY (8.0) INCLUDED WITH STUDENT SERVICES
DATE LAST UPDATE - 22186

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

FULL COST SUMMARY REPORT FROM CA-3
(1984 - 1985)
FOR
ALL COLLEGES

CCMIS 310
01/27/86
02:19 PM

CODES	PROGRAMS	FTE	INSTRUCTIONAL COST/FTE		OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL COST/FTE		COLLEGE-WIDE COST/FTE		TOTAL COST/FTE
1.1101	AGRIC/NAT RES.	3.1	1,642.40	28	2,240.80	38	2,020.40	34	5,903.60
1.1102	ARCHIT/ENVIRON								
1.1104	BIOLOGY	3,918.3	1.323.38	36	410.29	11	1.903.25	52	3.636.92
1.1109	ENGINEERING	7.9	1,554.69	39	497.84	13	1,884.37	48	3,936.91
1.1112	HEALTH	11.1	1.369.01	37	141.22	4	2.143.50	59	3.653.73
1.1119	PHYS. SCIENCE	6,084.1	1.458.40	39	368.83	10	1.935.34	51	3.762.57
1.1100	TOTAL PHYS. SCIENCES	10,024.5	1,405.66	38	385.46	10	1.923.01	52	3,714.13
1.1210	FINE ARTS	4,049.5	2.027.61	44	650.88	14	1.909.81	42	4.588.30
1.1311	FOREIGN LANG.	1.322.6	1.444.86	39	317.43	9	1.968.71	53	3,731.01
1.1315	LETTERS	15.953.5	1.318.91	37	254.94	7	1.943.64	55	3,517.49
1.1300	TOTAL LETTERS/LANG.	17.276.1	1.328.56	38	259.72	7	1.945.56	55	3.533.83
1.1408	EDUCATION	3.536.2	1.810.19	40	798.01	18	1.868.64	42	4,476.84
1.1505	BUS/MANAGEMENT	141.5	862.52	27	293.06	9	2.052.75	64	3,209.33
1.1607	COMPUTER SCI	21.7	1,419.95	38	311.08	8	1,971.84	53	3.702.86
1.1617	MATHEMATICS	12,913.1	1,090.25	34	214.85	7	1,912.15	59	3.216.96
1.1600	TOTAL MATH/COMP.SCI.	12,934.8	1,090.81	34	214.72	7	1.912.25	59	3,217.77
1.1703	AREA STUDIES	91.0	792.36	30	370.62	14	1,514.33	57	2.677.31
1.1720	PSYCHOLOGY	5,157.1	1,116.90	34	248.98	7	1,966.92	59	3,332.80
1.1722	SOCIAL SCIENCES	9,971.1	1,183.80	35	233.62	7	1,930.70	58	3,348.11
1.1700	TOTAL SOC. SCIENCES	15,219.2	1,158.79	35	239.64	7	1,940.48	58	3,338.91
1.1806	COMMUNICATIONS	292.0	1,885.36	45	525.11	13	1,788.94	43	4,199.40
1.1813	HOME ECONOMICS	37.5	2,013.99	40	953.57	19	2,048.73	41	5,016.29
1.1814	LAW								
1.1816	LIBRARY SCIENCE	9.5	1,187.78	37	8.92		2,054.14	63	3.250.84
1.1819	MILITARY SCIENCE	25.6	582.65	22	222.97	8	1,874.95	70	2,680.56
1.1821	PUBLIC AFFAIRS	20.2	1,407.50	38	266.99	7	2,042.33	55	3.716.82
1.1823	THEOLOGY								
1.1849	INTERDISC.	3.069.4	1,176.41	34	308.78	9	1,958.34	57	3,443.54
1.1800	TOT. OTHER DISCS.	3,454.2	1,242.42	35	332.36	9	1,945.14	55	3,519.92
1.1000	TOTAL A/P	66.636.0	1,317.77	37	321.73	9	1,928.49	54	3,568.00
1.2101	AGRICULT/TECH	356.4	2,028.70	44	722.56	16	1,825.30	40	4.576.56
1.2102	AGRICULT/VOC	368.1	744.83	30	401.88	16	1,331.99	54	2,478.71
	AGRICULT/SUPP	11.6	384.02	13	1,221.41	42	1,292.93	45	2.898.36
1.2100	TOTAL AGRICULTURE	736.1	1,360.76	39	570.06	16	1,570.22	45	3,501.05

FTE BASED ON 40/900 HOUR EQUIVALENTS.

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

CCMIS 308
01/28/86
09158 AM

DIRECT COST OF INSTRUCTION BY COLLEGE
1984-1985
1.1000 TOTAL A/P - COST PER FTE

COLLEGE	F.T.E.	- - - - - PERSONNEL COSTS - - - - INSTRUCTIONAL	ADMINISTRATIVE	SUPPORT STAFF	SUPPLIES SERVICES	EQUIPMENT DEPRECIATION	TOTAL
HILLSBOROUGH	3,440.4	1,113.59	16.34	94.61	50.97	8.87	1,284.39
BROWARD	6,185.4	1,096.41	72.98	99.98	76.65	15.61	1,361.63
VALENCIA	3,734.2	1,081.85	124.19	100.76	60.11	14.22	1,381.13
TALLAHASSEE	1,853.9	1,233.94	61.08	81.91	40.33	6.63	1,423.89
GULF COAST	1,268.6	1,210.19	61.02	62.06	72.21	34.15	1,439.63
MANATEE	1,753.9	1,171.09	104.14	86.55	72.08	24.33	1,458.19
EDISON	1,613.3	1,120.68	187.30	139.53	70.33	27.23	1,545.08
PASCO-HERNANDO	628.2	1,135.71	193.88	91.66	23.31	108.40	1,552.97
SANTA FE	2,794.6	1,346.71	64.40	100.40	32.15	11.59	1,555.24
ST. PETERSBURG	4,854.0	1,356.92	67.79	75.76	50.19	22.89	1,573.55
BREVARD	3,183.7	1,270.79	136.78	38.14	79.37	54.40	1,579.48
INDIAN RIVER	1,514.8	1,304.02	8.34	43.87	228.75	22.08	1,607.06
OKALOOSA-WALTON	1,101.1	1,465.36	38.68	56.62	45.13	12.38	1,618.17
MIAMI-DADE	14,494.3	1,288.53	100.74	190.54	62.03	16.55	1,658.39
POLK	1,341.2	1,343.14	105.56	97.35	108.12	69.99	1,724.17
CENTRAL FLORIDA	955.8	1,592.49	22.17	42.15	77.54	43.27	1,777.62
DAYTONA BEACH	1,902.7	1,329.34	75.80	180.17	131.85	61.44	1,778.61
PALM BEACH	3,277.4	1,308.85	75.86	88.00	272.78	107.41	1,852.89
LAKE-SUMTER	460.9	1,752.39	64.59	17.41	71.22	14.74	1,920.35
FLA JC AT JAX	3,714.6	1,676.84	77.14	51.86	93.49	21.41	1,920.74
PENSACOLA	2,637.5	1,496.52	70.89	312.75	73.06	19.77	1,973.00
LAKE CITY	580.9	1,910.54	1.07	95.70	31.26	18.36	2,056.93
FLORIDA KEYS	350.3	1,665.38	133.72	111.11	145.50	58.45	2,114.16
NORTH FLORIDA	287.7	1,849.32	69.93	72.75	99.17	54.71	2,145.86
SEMINOLE	1,500.1	1,521.94	160.25	188.44	330.04	36.52	2,237.19
CHIPOLA	540.1	1,939.00	110.74	70.65	90.89	34.12	2,245.40
ST. JOHNS RIVER	426.8	1,997.28	174.11	70.28	193.43	40.49	2,475.57
SOUTH FLORIDA	239.6	2,369.84	60.16		111.13	58.23	2,599.36
TOTAL: WEIGHTED AVERAGE	66,636.0	1,317.82	86.20	119.15	88.00	28.33	1,639.50

SOURCES:FAFVOCS485 03/08/56 CA285 07/20/09

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

PERSONNEL - POSITIONS, EXPENDITURES, AND COST
1984-1985
1.1000 TOTAL A/P

CCMIS 510
01/27/86
01:33 PM

COLLEGE	- - - INSTRUCTIONAL - - -			- - ADMINISTRATIVE - -			- - - SUPPORT STAFF - - -			PERSONNEL COSTS PER FTE STUDENT
	FTE POSI	EXPEND	/POSI	FTE POSI	EXPEND	/POSI	FTE POSI	EXPEND	/POSI	
HILLSBOROUGH	148.91	3,831,194	25,728	1.32	56,230	42.598	21.29	325.507	15.289	1.224.55
BROWARD	244.99	6,781,755	27,682	12.08	451,431	37,370	34.80	618.416	17.771	1.269.38
VALENCIA	166.60	4,039,830	24,249	10.10	463,765	45.917	23.10	376.267	16.289	1.308.80
GULF COAST	56.80	1,535,242	27,029	1.86	77,404	41.615	4.00	78.733	19.683	1.333.26
INDIAN RIVER	70.52	1,975,326	28,011	0.35	12,635	36.100	3.27	66.452	20.322	1.356.23
MANATEE	70.35	2,053,971	29,196	4.38	182,652	41.701	9.59	151.806	15.830	1.361.78
TALLAHASSEE	62.28	2,287,610	36,731	2.44	113,241	46.410	10.38	151.865	14.630	1.376.94
PASCO-HERNANDO	50.82	713,456	14,039	3.18	121,797	38.301	4.62	57.583	12.464	1.421.26
BREVARD	134.30	4,045,801	30,125	12.50	435,482	34.839	8.90	121.427	13.643	1.445.71
EDISON	68.50	1,807,999	26,394	8.53	302.165	35.424	14.63	225.103	15.386	1.447.51
PALM BEACH	132.74	4,289,631	32,316	5.28	248.623	47.088	17.44	288.401	16.537	1.472.71
ST. PETERSBURG	198.65	6,586,486	33,156	7.30	329,072	45.078	20.78	367.726	17.696	1.500.47
SANTA FE	127.80	3,763,519	29,449	4.80	179,968	37.493	19.20	280.567	14.613	1.511.91
POLK	58.44	1,801,418	30,825	3.83	141,578	36.965	9.01	130.565	14.491	1.546.05
OKALOOSA-WALTON	53.46	1,613,506	30,182	1.09	42.592	39.075	4.65	62.343	13.407	1.560.66
MIAMI-DADE	587.72	18,676,397	31,778	36.08	1.460.107	40.469	170.03	2.761.702	16.242	1.579.81
DAYTONA BEACH	145.23	2,529,335	17,416	2.87	144.227	50.253	19.56	342.816	17.526	1.585.31
CENTRAL FLORIDA	53.30	1,522,106	28,557	1.02	21.186	20.771	3.36	40.286	11.990	1.656.81
FLA JC AT JAX	244.30	6,228,796	25,497	7.50	286.535	38.205	11.50	192.637	16.751	1.805.84
LAKE SUMTER	27.65	807,676	29,211	1.01	29.772	29.477	0.42	8.026	19.110	1.834.40
SEMINOLE	85.80	2,283,069	26,609	4.49	240,386	53.538	22.66	282.672	12.474	1.870.63
PENSACOLA	121.10	3,947,080	32,594	3.10	186,979	60.316	51.30	824.889	16.080	1.880.17
FLORIDA KEYS	28.00	583,384	20,835	1.51	46,841	31.021	2.41	38.923	16.151	1.910.21
NORTH FLORIDA	22.69	532,048	23,449	0.55	20,118	36.579	1.60	20.929	13.081	1.991.99
LAKE CITY	40.97	1,109,830	27,089	0.16	622	3,887	6.36	55.595	8.741	2.007.31
CHIPOLA	29.73	1,047,252	35,225	1.54	59,813	38.840	2.40	38.158	15.899	2.120.39
ST. JOHNS RIVER	33.00	852,437	25,831	2.66	74,309	27.936	2.70	29.994	11.109	2.241.66
SOUTH FLORIDA	21.41	567,814	26,521	0.55	14,414	26.208				2.430.00
TOTAL: WEIGHTED AVERAGE	3,086.06	87,813,968	28,455	142.08	5.743.943	40.428	499.96	7.939.379	15.880	1.523.16

SOURCES: FAFV OCS4 , CA-2
FAFVOCS485 03/08/56 CA285 07/20/09

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

DIRECT COST OF SUPPORT PROGRAMS BY COLLEGE
1984-1985
2.0000 TOTAL SUPPORT - COST PER FTE

CCMIS 308
01/28/86
10:01 AM

COLLEGE	F.T.E.	PERSONNEL COSTS EXEC. ADMIN. MANAGERIAL	 NON-INSTRUCT. PROFESSIONAL	 SUPPORT STAFF	SUPPLIES SERVICES	EQUIPMENT DEPRECIATION	TOTAL
SEMINOLE	5,394.5	132.32	243.38	418.63	245.00	58.76	1,098.10
SOUTH FLORIDA	1,424.1	255.91	125.04	378.13	514.18	104.69	1,377.94
TALLAHASSEE	2,617.6	257.21	175.86	490.78	387.57	107.02	1,418.43
LAKE CITY	2,346.4	314.44	66.48	522.83	511.96	61.12	1,476.83
INDIAN RIVER	4,896.8	106.33	234.81	600.30	462.95	74.38	1,478.77
DAYTONA BEACH	7,122.6	188.74	109.41	737.27	452.28	55.64	1,543.33
OKALOOSA-WALTON	2,219.1	265.98	280.69	553.41	385.03	73.71	1.558.83
ST. PETERSBURG	8,776.6	189.29	301.02	590.56	382.95	97.22	1.561.05
POLK	2,446.2	330.33	168.95	653.20	423.83	56.82	1.633.13
EDISON	2,736.3	306.92	132.47	645.12	498.17	50.91	1.633.59
PALM BEACH	5,733.2	232.94	345.06	729.09	242.10	115.40	1.664.59
BREVARD	7,493.5	174.89	410.36	426.04	599.58	67.34	1.678.20
PASCO HERNANDO	1,528.8	309.04	135.21	581.80	609.60	80.71	1.716.35
MANATEE	3,184.0	298.74	273.72	634.06	495.27	64.79	1.766.59
PENSACOLA	7,407.5	171.28	286.26	633.29	533.46	156.53	1.780.82
SANTA FE	5,129.8	213.65	328.75	808.21	438.50	62.52	1.851.64
VALENCIA	5,951.3	181.88	230.20	902.74	523.90	53.16	1.891.98
BROWARD	10,017.6	259.11	176.87	793.02	626.92	61.19	1.916.11
GULF COAST	2,113.9	243.30	378.26	673.65	923.38	105.77	1,924.36
FLA JC AT JAX	12,086.6	269.78	224.38	914.96	506.09	63.19	1.978.41
NORTH FLORIDA	677.7	271.97	272.05	711.56	676.96	77.58	2,010.13
MIAMI-DADE	24,422.1	91.73	488.52	807.10	535.51	89.03	2.011.88
CENTRAL FLORIDA	2,147.5	324.02	291.51	807.02	514.42	93.78	2.080.75
HILLSBOROUGH	5,824.4	354.05	142.17	844.56	713.11	87.01	2,140.90
CHIPOLA	1,012.4	339.04	440.87	566.32	897.47	80.62	2.324.32
LAKE-SUMTER	926.9	286.94	485.59	949.56	659.15	116.40	2.497.63
ST. JOHNS RIVER	716.3	769.68	168.48	736.21	778.05	48.63	2.501.05
FLORIDA KEYS	761.7	478.59	368.52	870.73	1,006.01	71.21	2.795.05
TOTAL: WEIGHTED AVERAGE	137,113.3	210.40	288.27	712.39	504.86	80.80	1.796.53

SOURCES:FAFVOCS485 03/08/56 CA285207/20/09

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FLORIDA
COMMUNITY
COLLEGES

PERSONNEL - POSITIONS, EXPENDITURES, AND COST
1984-1985
2.0000 TOTAL SUPPORT

CCMIS 510
01/27/86
01:35 PM

241/242

COLLEGE	EXEC, ADMIN, MAN			OTHER PROFESSIONAL			SUPPORT STAFF			PERSONNEL COSTS PER FTE STUDENT
	FTE POSI	EXPEND	/POSI	FTE POSI	EXPEND	/POSI	FTE POSI	EXPEND	/POSI	
SOUTH FLORIDA	7.80	364,436	46,723	7.70	178,066	23,125	32.60	538,494	16,518	759.07
SEMINOLE	12.76	713,798	55,940	37.87	1,312,929	34,669	179.81	2,258,313	12,559	794.34
LAKE CITY	25.40	737,812	29,048	7.05	155,985	22,126	87.65	1,226,759	13,996	903.75
TALLAHASSEE	15.40	673,284	43,720	15.25	460,327	30,185	85.18	1,284,657	15,082	923.85
INDIAN RIVER	10.31	520,653	50,500	30.59	1,149,828	37,588	156.51	2,939,555	18,782	941.44
BREVARD	30.10	1,310,536	43,539	121.00	3,075,037	25,414	262.60	3,192,497	12,157	1,011.29
PASCO-HERNANDO	11.75	472,464	40,210	9.20	206,712	22,469	69.61	889,450	12,778	1,026.05
DAYTONA BEACH	30.75	1,344,335	43,718	24.53	779,266	31,768	321.15	5,251,256	16,351	1,035.42
ST. PETERSBURG	35.30	1,661,339	47,063	79.20	2,641,909	33,357	367.63	5,183,091	14,099	1,080.88
EDISON	23.02	839,527	36,469	14.45	362,339	25,075	127.53	1,764,605	13,837	1,084.51
PENSACOLA	25.90	1,268,782	48,988	77.10	2,120,467	27,503	341.40	4,691,060	13,741	1,090.83
OKALOOSA-WALTON	13.30	590,227	44,378	18.74	622,878	33,238	87.95	1,228,082	13,963	1,100.08
POLK	18.59	807,734	43,450	13.93	413,107	29,656	110.68	1,597,194	14,431	1,152.48
MANATEE	20.33	951,202	46,788	34.05	871,540	25,596	137.41	2,018,843	14,692	1,206.53
BROWARD	56.51	2,595,704	45,934	50.37	1,761,781	34,977	502.01	7,944,139	15,825	1,228.00
NORTH FLORIDA	4.40	184,316	41,890	8.16	184,366	22,594	36.53	482,228	13,201	1,255.58
GULF COAST	10.50	514,319	48,983	23.33	799,605	34,274	84.15	1,424,019	16,922	1,295.21
PALM BEACH	26.99	1,335,486	49,481	57.82	1,978,318	34,215	242.50	4,180,032	17,237	1,307.09
VALENCIA	19.60	1,082,995	55,255	36.00	1,370,001	38,056	350.00	5,372,464	15,350	1,314.92
HILLSBOROUGH	44.03	2,062,149	46,835	34.05	828,054	24,319	321.67	4,919,034	15,297	1,340.78
CHIPOLA	8.92	343,246	38,480	18.62	446,339	23,971	49.55	573,338	11,571	1,346.23
SANTA FE	25.70	1,096,001	42,646	56.20	1,686,424	30,008	316.90	4,146,968	13,083	1,350.62
MIAMI-DADE	40.80	2,240,205	54,907	392.70	11,930,663	30,381	1,394.14	19,711,001	14,138	1,387.34
FLA JC AT JAX	76.50	3,260,774	42,624	60.90	2,711,935	44,531	577.80	11,058,762	19,139	1,409.12
CENTRAL FLORIDA	15.50	695,823	44,892	20.95	626,017	29,881	111.20	1,733,076	15,585	1,422.55
ST. JOHNS RIVER	14.60	551,321	37,762	5.10	120,684	23,664	44.73	527,348	11,790	1,674.37
FLORIDA KEYS	8.13	364,540	44,839	10.13	280,702	27,710	49.76	663,232	13,329	1,717.83
LAKE-SUMTER	6.00	265,968	44,328	14.67	450,092	30,681	56.30	880,145	15,633	1,722.09
TOTAL: WEIGHTED AVERAGE	638.89	28,848,976	45,155	1,279.66	39,525,372	30,887	6,504.85	97,678,642	15,016	1,211.06

SOURCES: FAFV OCS4 2, CA-2
FAFVOCS485 03/08/56 CA285 07/20/09

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX TWELVE

Attendance at Hearings

Hearing at Gulf Coast Community College

1. Linda Adair, GCCC
2. James H. Ammons, FAMU
3. Earl Carroll, CJC
4. Henry Cordell, GCCC
5. Margaret Crozier, OWCC
6. Bob Culbertson, TCC
7. Jim Davis, TCC
8. Jim Durham, OWCC
9. Wes Estey, CJC
10. Tom Furlong, TCC
11. Glenda G. Hamby, Bay County School District
12. Dorothy P. Harris, OWCC
13. Ron Head, OWCC
14. Lewis Heckroth, OWCC
15. Mary Henderson, OWCC
16. Cliff Herron, OWCC
17. Ann Higgins, GCCC
18. Edward Howard, TCC
19. Pamela C. Jackson, FSU
20. Ann James, OWCC
21. Robert C. Jones, GCCC
22. Marshall Miller, TCC
23. Samdra Mitchell, FSU
24. Dave Nicholson, CJC
25. Fred Sale, GCCC
26. Roy W. Smith, GCCC
27. Ann Syfrett, GCCC
28. Pamela Whitelock, GCCC

Hearing at Lake City Community College

1. David Bathe, SFeCC
2. Karen Belcher, LCCC
3. Efrain Bonilla, LCCC
4. Scott Elliott, CFCC
5. Dennis P. Gallon, FCCJ
6. Joan Golliday, SFeCC
7. Mary Holton, CFCC
8. Bill Jacobs, LCCC
9. Dennis King, LCCC
10. Leslie A. Lambert, SFeCC
11. Tim Moses, LCCC
12. David A. Richards, LCCC

13. Mike Rigsby, LCCC
14. Barbara R. Sloan, SFeCC
15. Gene Street, LCCC
16. Susan Summers, LCCC
17. E. B. Wiley, SJRCC
18. Isaac Williams, Jr., CFCC

Hearing at Manatee Community College

1. Bobbie Briggs, Manatee County School District
2. Howard Crawford, SoFCC
3. Bob Eberley, MCC
4. Robert Fitzgerald, SoFCC
5. W. Aubrey Gardner, SoFCC
6. Betty E. Gillies, USF
7. Ronald G. Lawman, MCC
8. Dorothy L. Lord, ECC
9. Bette L. McDearman, SoFCC
10. Mike Mears, MCC
11. Dale H. Melton, MCC
12. James Newton, ECC
13. Angela A. Rapkin, MCC
14. Darlene C. Wedler-Johnson, MCC
15. Laura E. Wiggins, MCC

Hearing at Broward Community College

1. Dennis Alber, PBCC
2. Katherine E. Amos, BroCC
3. Ann Baldwin, MDCC
4. Stephen Barker, BroCC
5. Donna Battle, BroCC
6. Judy A. Blucker, FIU
7. Henri Sue Bynum, IRCC
8. Connie Cagley, BroCC
9. Claudia Chiesi, PBCC
10. John Connolly, PBCC
11. Jean Cosgrove, BroCC
12. Robert Deger, MDCC
13. Elvira Dunlevy, BroCC
14. William Eldridge, FKCC
15. Armando Ferrer, MDCC
16. LiAnne Gabe, BroCC
17. Ned Glenn, MDCC
18. Blanca M. Gonzalez, MDCC
19. Peggy Green, BroCC
20. Helen Hayford, Brown University
21. Toni Haynes, PBCC
22. Donna Henderson, BroCC

23. Marie Hydress, MDCC
24. Frank Inciardi, BroCC
25. Jon D. Kitner, MDCC
26. Rosemary Lanshe, BroCC
27. Jeffrey D. Lukenbill, MDCC
28. Susan Malter, BroCC
29. Hank Martel, BroCC
30. Darlene Nolan, BroCC
31. James Ottowell, PBCC
32. Betty Owen, BroCC
33. Bill Porterfield, BroCC
34. Glen A. Rose, BroCC
35. Donald Schaffer, BroCC
36. Mont Smith, BroCC
37. Ted Smith, BroCC
38. Larry Steed, MDCC
39. Joyanne Stephens, FAU
40. Susan Taggart, IRCC
41. Jim Tanner, PBCC
42. Blair Thorburn, FAU
43. Karen Walsh, BroCC
44. S. M. Weitzman, BroCC
45. Hettie M. Williams, BroCC
46. Ted Wright, BroCC

Hearing at Valencia Community College

1. Carolyn Allen, VCC
2. Donald Altieri, SPJC
3. Hugh B. Anderson, PCC
4. Bob Beaman, HCC
5. Rheta Beaver, VCC
6. Ralph Boston, UCF
7. Ron Brandolini, VCC
8. Rita Clements, Lake County School District
9. David Dees, UCF
10. Bill Edwards, VCC
11. Diana Ferreira, HCC
12. William L. Ferron, PCC
13. Jared Graber, LSCC
14. Carol Johnson, VCC
15. Judith M. Jones, VCC
16. Lula Keyes, VCC
17. Bob Levin, SCC
18. Ron Nelson, VCC
19. William B. Nunn, BreCC
20. Mary Jo Pecht, VCC
21. Bert Purga, BreCC
22. Keith Samuels, SCC
23. William R. Swinford, PCC

24. Qurentia Throm, VCC
25. Penny Villegas, VCC
26. Silvia Zapico, VCC

APPENDIX THIRTEEN

List of Recommendations

These recommendations first appear in the chapter on findings, along with the information that supports them. They are repeated here for quick reference.

Recommendation 1.-- Recommend the parameters used with the data on the annual Level I data displays of the associate in arts degree program review process be evaluated, and appropriate modifications accomplished for use with future data displays.

Recommendation 2.-- Recommend the Division of Community Colleges devise additional strategies for distributing the associate in arts degree program review Level I data displays and for expanding their use, so that community college and university personnel more uniformly will know of them, have access to them, understand them, and use them.

Recommendation 3.-- Recommend that the community colleges, the universities, and Divisions of Community Colleges and Universities continue to study the differences in university upper division performance of community college associate in arts degree graduates, other transfer students, and native university students.

Recommendation 4.-- Recommend each community college recognize that the associate in arts degree program review Level II articulation meetings are appropriately defined as program development under Rule 6A-14.029(2), FAC, and qualify for staff and program development funds.

Recommendation 5.-- Recommend the community colleges investigate assertions of incorrect transfer of credit policies to determine the facts, and submit the particulars to the Articulation Coordinating Committee when assertions are found to be correct.

Recommendation 6.-- Recommend each community college monitor grade distributions and determine whether the grade distributions are consistent with the performance standards, instructional process, grading process, and other variables at that institution.

Recommendation 7.-- Recommend that as soon as the conversion of the Community College Management Information System to a student level data system is completed, the Division of Community Colleges begin a project of keeping track of the progress of students who are seeking the associate in arts degree to determine the percentages who graduate in various periods of time.

Recommendation 8.-- Recommend that each community college recognize that black participation in the associate in arts degree program systemwide is less than black participation in degree/certificate programs overall, and investigate to determine whether that is true in their college. Recommend further that each community college that finds the systemwide condition reflected in their college adjust its equal access and equal opportunity plan to place additional emphasis on the associate in arts degree program.

Recommendation 9.-- Recommend that each community college board of trustees require the necessary curriculum adjustments to be made in its required English and mathematics courses for the associate in arts degree to include all the skills listed in Rule 6A-10.0310, FAC; and require all of the instructors of those courses to teach the skills; and require a procedure to be installed and applied to assure that the skills are taught.

Recommendation 10.-- Recommend support of the additional legislative funding requested in the 1991-93 legislative budget request to enable each community college to provide instructional designs and services to improve the teaching and learning of the English and mathematics knowledge and skills measured on the College-Level Academic Skills Test.

Recommendation 11.-- Recommend support of the additional legislative funding requested in the 1991-93 legislative budget request to enable the community colleges to provide college preparatory instruction to remediate the academic deficiencies of their students to the extent of the need.

Recommendation 12.-- Recommend the Division of Community Colleges conduct a study to determine the proportion of the students who need college preparatory instruction who completed public school courses to prepare them for college and who entered a community college without delay after high school graduation.

Recommendation 13.-- Recommend that community colleges schedule, on at least an annual basis, formal meetings between their associate in arts degree program faculty and district junior high/middle school and senior high school faculty, curriculum coordinators, and guidance counselors to discuss college entry level expectations, student performance, and curriculum. Further, recommend that informal opportunities for such interaction be pursued year-round.

Recommendation 14.-- Recommend that community colleges advise the high schools in their districts that the courses and course distribution recommended by the State University System for college bound high school students also is recommended by the State Community College System. Further, recommend that appropriate community college publications and Department of Education publications include the courses and course distribution detail.

Recommendation 15.-- Recommend the Articulation

Coordinating Committee proceed with modifications to Rule 6A-10.0315, FAC, to make comparable the score standards therein for college preparatory testing.

Recommendation 16.-- Recommend the Department of Education establish a College Preparatory Instruction Project fashioned similar to the initial College-Level Academic Skills Project to determine the knowledge and skills essential for students to have in order to enroll in college credit courses, to establish a single testing instrument to be administered in the high schools to determine whether students have the knowledge and skills, and to relate the knowledge and skills to the skills tested on the College-Level Academic Skills Test.

Recommendation 17.-- Recommend that Rule 6A-10.0315, FAC, be amended to establish scores on the entry-level tests therein below which students shall be judged to have reading, writing, and mathematics skills limited to the eighth grade level or below, and to require that such students be referred to the nearest adult basic education programs and refused admission to college preparatory courses and college credit courses until their skill levels reach secondary level, at which time they may be accepted in college preparatory courses.

Recommendation 18.-- Recommend the personnel positions assigned to the Division of Community Colleges and funded be increased to provide research services, especially to capitalize on the research potential of the new student-based data collection system.

Recommendation 19.-- Recommend Rule 6A-14.030(1), FAC, be amended in the fourth sentence to read: Upon satisfactory completion of a planned program of at least sixty (60) college credits, including the demonstration of the attainment of predetermined and specified performance requirements, and subject to law and rule, the associate in arts degree shall be awarded.

Recommendation 20.-- Recommend that each community college develop a statement of the purpose of the general education core of the associate in arts degree program that contains sufficient detail to identify each component of the general education core and sufficient functional specificity to provide for application and measurement.

Recommendation 21.-- Recommend that each community college that has not done so examine the general education core of its associate in arts degree program to determine whether the core includes international awareness/education in proportion to the need in Florida and the world today, and adjust the general education core consistent with the findings.

Recommendation 22.-- Recommend that the community colleges review their selection criteria for full-time and part-time faculty who teach advanced and professional courses to assure that the selection criteria include criteria that specifically address separate teaching positions and the tasks to be performed in those positions.

Recommendation 23.-- Recommend that the changes currently being made in the data collection system of the Division of Community Colleges assure the collection of adequate data to enable defining, tracking, and projecting enrollment trends, faculty attrition, faculty composition, and other faculty characteristics by discipline in order to support extensive studies of those critical issues to provide state level and institutional decision makers with the information necessary to take informed action.

Recommendation 24.-- Recommend that community colleges evaluate their library services on campus and at off-campus sites to ensure that basic library services are provided as required in the criteria for accreditation by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Recommendation 25.-- Recommend the community colleges continue their efforts to provide sufficient computer terminals connected to the Florida Information Resources Network (FIRN) and programmed for the Student On-Line Advisement and Articulation System (SOLAR) to give their students and counselors easy access to SOLAR.

Recommendation 26.-- Recommend that the full-time equivalant student enrollment factored into the legislative budget request and appropriation for the Community College Program Fund be based on the actual enrollment for the year immediately preceding the budget year.

Recommendation 27.-- Recommend that each community college establish and carry out a strategy of persistent and pervasive structuring of the college environment to bring about direct interaction among ethnic groups in all aspects of campus life.

State of Florida
Department of Education
Betty Castor, Commissioner
Tallahassee, Florida
Affirmative action/equal opportunity employer

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ERIC Clearinghouse for
Junior Colleges APR 19 1991